The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXVIII, No. 3 March, 1953

CONTENTS

Mary's Presentation and the Priestly Dedication *Philip M. Hannan* 161

Canon Sheehan .... *Liam Brophy* 164

The Parish Priest and Religious Vocations *Edward F. Garesché, S.J.* 170

Infallibility in the Encyclicals .... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 177

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Legacies for Masses and the Lawyer's Duty 199

A Spiritual Director's Obligation of Secrecy 200

The Mixed Marriage Guarantees 201

A Correction 202

Absolution after Requiem Mass 202

Purifying the Communion Plate 203

Disposal of Blessed Water 203

Responsory Problems 203

Christmas Customs 204

Forty Hours' Throne 204

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

Assistant Priest at Pontifical Mass 205

Oratio pro patre et matre 205

ANALECTA

The Official Latin Text and an English Translation of the Constitution *Christus Dominus* and of the Accompanying Holy Office Instruction 207

BOOK REVIEWS

Guide to the Bible. Vol. I, *published under the Direction of A. Robert and T. Tricot. Translated by Edward P. Arbez, S.S., and Martin R. P. McGuire* 235

Heaven and Earth, *by Carlo Coccioli* 236

Effective Preaching, *by Thomas V. Liske* 238

The Existentialist Revolt, *by Kurt F. Reinhardt* 240

A Friendly Easter Thought

What Easier-to-Give and More Valued
GIFT To Your Teacher Friends
Than a Subscription to

The Catholic Educational Review

Edited under the direction of the Department of Education, The Catholic University of America, and published monthly from September through June.

Articles on education problems, projects, techniques—Abstracts—News from the educational field—Notes—Book reviews—Covers the elementary, high school, and college levels.

Indexed in The Catholic Periodical Index, The Education Index, and The Guide to Catholic Literature.

No Catholic school, library, rectory, educator, or priest can afford to be without it.

Subscription: **United States, Canada and Foreign $4.00: Single Number 40c**

You are Cordially Invited to Visit our Display (Booth G-38) at the National Catholic Education Association 50th Annual Convention in Atlantic City, April 6-10, 1953.

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

MARY'S PRESENTATION AND THE PRIESTLY DEDICATION

Practically every person in this country today is voluble about his rights; he knows what to expect (as he should) from his employer, from his community, from his state, from the nation. He learns to work and to give in a meter-service fashion, measuring out his services by the clock or by the scale. Often if he is a professional man he wishes to maintain the prestige of the profession with the convenience of a workingman's hours. He lives in a kind of regulated economy which does not lead to heroic endeavor and although it is in accordance with the laws of justice it does not always teach that what a man receives in his right hand, he must, in some way, return by his left.

But such measuring and bargaining is not of the world of the spirit and of a religious vocation and those who enter it must be determined to break contact with that world. For in this world of the spiritual there is only total dedication and devotion as exemplified so appealingly in the Presentation of the Blessed Mother.

The substance of her action was that she gave herself completely to the service of God. Her basic sacrifice was not that she took a vow of virginity but that she dedicated herself to God. This dedication of her virginity was only an indication of her total devotion to God. This total dedication was her glory, her achievement that was the basis of all that God gave her, using her perfect compliance as a mold for His designs.

And basically, that must be our goal—to achieve a total dedication of ourselves to God. The question that confronts us is not whether we can give up family life, give up natural and legitimate business ambitions, give up a life of comparative independence, but whether we can give ourselves to God. A vocation is not a vacuum of the passions—it is a dedication and using of the passions for the glory of God. It is absurd to think that a man would make a good priest just because he doesn't like to drink, doesn't like the company of women, doesn't like wealth, in fact, doesn't like anything but himself—for Judas basically just liked his own welfare.

Complete pliability, like potter's clay, is especially needed of secular priests, priests to be used in any capacity by the Ordinary. The Bishop has a right to expect that we perform any task within the limits of the moral law. Never underestimate the value of any instrument for the sake of souls—after all a fish hook is a very meager and cheap instrument.

The Presentation offers a further lesson to candidates for the secular priesthood by showing that heroic achievement comes from the sanctification of the ordinary, the usual, the humdrum, because everything ordinary is universal. The Blessed Virgin made her complete dedication to God in the usual manner, complying with the normal procedure for such acts of sacrifice.

We in this country tend to forget the extraordinary opportunities we have in every parish, in the ordinary activities of parish life. Very few realize the tremendous opportunities of an "ordinary" parish in this country. In Prussia toward the end of the war, I heard that there was a movement toward the Church in Germany as a result of the war, and so I seized on an opportunity to speak with a Catholic priest near Berlin to talk about this encouraging and surprising movement. He seemed to be very cool and unenthusiastic about it so finally I, rather impatiently, asked how many converts he had. "Well," he said, "I have been a priest here for a little over fifteen years and I have had two or three converts!" Compare that number with the fact that in this city there is no priest who does not have difficulty finding time to instruct the converts who come to him! In the Archdiocese of Washington, despite the fact that some sections of it have been Catholic for over three hundred years and therefore have little possibility of convert-making, we have an average of nine converts for each priest a year. All this is done through normal parish activities.

I have had an opportunity to work as a priest in many European countries and my experience has been that it is parish work that is of paramount importance. During the past summer, I visited the Red-dominated district of St. Denis near Paris and spoke with the pastor of the great abbey of St. Denis. Opposite to the Abbey is the city hall dominated by the Reds and I asked him how the struggle was developing. He pointed a finger at the venerable old city hall and said, "Our friends, the Reds, are in power over there but we are winning the people back through the parish. We don't fear them at all." And this was said in the section where we were told the Church had to do its work by sending priests out as workers (the Missions of Paris) to bring the workers back to the Church. Remember that their efforts must be to bring them back to parish life. And what they do so painstakingly, we in the United States can do in every parish.

I regret to hear priests say glowingly that the future of the Church is in Japan, or China, or India. Maybe the future is—but the present of the Church is here, the strongest nation in the world. Never in the history of the Church has Christianity been able to wield a world-wide influence without winning the strongest nation to its principles. For the same reason that impelled St. Peter to go to Rome, we must be determined to make the most of the tremendous opportunities we have in this nation. The world will never be converted if, beguiled by the exotic, the far-off, and the unusual, we neglect the opportunities here. And we shall never realize these immense opportunities unless we realize that the one key to unlock the power and the love of God is total devotion to the service of God, the presentation of our full strength to God as commemorated in the feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin.

PHILIP M. HANNAN

Washington, D. C.

CANON SHEEHAN

It was due to the timely discernment of Rev. Dr. Herman J. Heuser, editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* that the genius of Canon Sheehan was encouraged and its mature fruits given for the nourishment of Catholic thought far beyond the parish boundaries of Doneraile. Though Canon Sheehan lived in a remote part of Ireland—"I am much embarrassed at my distance from civilization here" he wrote to a friend—when the worries and woes of his distressful nation crowded up the mental horizon of his time, he was able, without losing any compassion for his beloved people, to sort out the trends of the time, project them and foretell their accelerating course. He braved the misunderstandings of his fellow-priests and his people that he might be justified in his wisdom by a generation such as ours which is witnessing the convergence of the evils which he identified near their sources. To combat the future predominance of those evils he called for the education of an alert, intelligent Catholic laity. He addressed himself chiefly to the youth of his day that posterity might be able to meet the menaces which were even then gathering momentum.

Canon Sheehan's first novel, *Geoffrey Austin, Student,* was addressed "to the Catholic youth of Ireland, in whose future our highest hopes are involved." It was followed three years later by a sequel entitled *The Triumph of Failure,* which its author considered his best book, a view shared by many eminent critics and endorsed, as I know from personal contacts, by the Catholic university students of Germany, many of whom, I discovered, knew the masterpiece almost by heart and rightly regarded it as a treasure-house of Catholic thoughts and theories.

Neither of these books was appreciated in their author's own country. It may be that Catholic students had not reached a state of sufficient maturity to appreciate their deep wisdom or that their teachers were not aware of the sinister dangers of secularism inherent in the educational theories they were obliged to put into effect. The critics then, as in almost every age, were not prepared for novel ideas which were really the recastings of ancient Christian wisdom, and disparaged what they did not understand. One noted American author has remarked of critics in general that nothing hurts them like a new idea. The good Canon's pearls might have been cast in vain had not a happy chance put *Geoffrey Austin* into the hands of Father Heuser, who immediately recognized the genius of its author and the immense potentiality for good contained in his propaganda-novel. Father Heuser lost no time in getting in touch with the author with the result that the classic of priestly life, *My New Curate,* was run as a serial in *The Ecclesiastical Review.* This prepared the way for its enthusiastic reception when it appeared in book form later. Its translation into French, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Hungarian and Ruthenian spread the Canon's fame so far abroad that the great Tolstoi came to read him and declared him to be "the greatest living novelist."

Canon Sheehan, like G. K. Chesterton, was a firm believer in "the novel with a purpose." Every novel, of course, must have a purpose, even if it is only to amuse, bemuse or abuse the minds of frivolous readers. But no novelist worthy of his vocation, especially if that vocation be involved in the infinitely higher one of the priest, can have any other purpose than that of final *catharsis.* It was Pascal who remarked that every philosophy, with the exception of Christianity, tends to express man's personality either in terms of utter weakness or exaggerated strength. If you consider the heroes of most modern fiction you will discover that they are either simians or supermen. And Jacques Maritain, in his provocative essay on the difficult art of the novel, remarked that "only a Christian, nay a mystic, because he has some idea of what there is in man, can be a complete novelist." Who has a more intimate knowledge of what there is in man than the Catholic priest? But, without entering into the thorny discussion of "the Catholic novel," we assert that every novel written by a Catholic, because it is a work of art, and therefore an expression of its creator's philosophy of life, must be a presentation of the Catholic point of view, and that point of view must always include the duty of ennobling human nature even while holding the mirror of realist or romantic fiction up to it.

Canon Sheehan's purpose as a novelist was to so ennoble the Catholic youth of his time that they should be mentally and spiritually equipped for the coming conflict with the Cosmocrats of the Dark Aeon. Here is a typical exhortation from *The Triumph of Failure:*

If then, this Church is the bulwark of modern society, can there be a more ignoble destiny than to sit still and let her, unaided and single-handed, confront the vast and terrific forces that are arrayed against her? On the other hand, can there be a more sublime destiny, or a more noble undertaking, than to stand by her side and throw in such little forces as are placed at our disposal, in her support and for the confusion of her enemies. Yet, hitherto, the entire struggle has been tacitly left by laymen in the hands of the captains of the King's hosts. Against all the natural and supernatural agencies at work in the world opposed to God and its Christ—heresy and infidelity, with their tremendous intellectual forces; irreligious governments, with all state appliances, treasuries, armies and navies at their disposal; the press, with its far-reaching power; literature, that derives its supreme attraction from its un-Christian or immoral teachings; art, that is the workshop of Satan; politics that would exile Christ from the world; the drink syndicates, that are becoming omnipotent through human impotency; the social evil that has forced itself to become State-recognised; schools from which God is banished; family circles where religion is never mentioned; society that would take offense at God's name—in a word, against all the professed badness of the world, and all the unconfessed indifference marshalled in hostile array, as Lucifer marshalled his unthroned hosts, there stand timidly on the side of Christ a handful of priests, a few weak women, a literature that is saved from ridicule barely by its good intentions, and a few saints, who lift their hands, like Moses from the mountain, whilst the armies of Israel are hard pressed in the valleys of humiliation and defeat. All this time what are Catholic laymen doing? Absolutely nothing, either defensive or aggressive. With the exception of a few Vincent de Paul societies, there is absolutely no organization that would combine in one solid body all the zeal and talent of thousands of young men who would dare and do a great deal for Jesus Christ, but who are now kept back, from want of an inspiring voice that would tell them go and take your place under the red banner, and throw in all your resources of mind and body to destroy the empire of Belial and extend the empire of Christ.

Catholic Action has become a potent, organized force since that challenge was thrown out to young Irishmen, and so have the forces of secularism. It was through education that the seeds of secularism were being sown in Ireland, and it was by a profoundly Catholic education that the Canon sought to resist it. He saw that the educational system imposed by England on Ireland was achieving in a short time what British rule and guns had not been able to do in centuries—subjugate the soul of Ireland. That education was in every way hostile to the religion and traditions of the Irish people. It was cunningly designed to make them oblivious of their national heritage and of the spiritual grandeurs of their Faith. It was designed to promote Catholic inaction. The Irish Catholics had been driven underground in the long centuries of persecution so they had, as the Canon said, through one of his characters, "no recollection of words, hallowed by sacred lips and places, no memory of choirs, stained by the reflected lights from noble windows: no abiding echoes of sacred music heard in the long twilight of summer . . . no divine panorama of the history of the Church, its power, its organization, its influence; and no appeal to strong emotional natures to lift up their eyes to the Heavenly City. . . ." The educational system designed in Westminster was almost successful in making the break with the Catholic and Celtic past complete. Canon Sheehan, and the earnest enthusiasts of the Gaelic League, almost succeeded in re-establishing full contact with the splendid Christian tradition of Europe which Irishmen had once saved from extinction.

The creation of an intelligent Catholic laity in Ireland was a difficult task and one fraught with endless possibilities of bitter misunderstandings. Cardinal Newman had been the lofty-souled martyr of such misunderstandings when he came to Ireland to found a Catholic university. In his immortal blueprint for the university of his dreams, *The Idea of a University,* he stated his aim:

> I want laymen, not arrogant, not rash in speech, not disputatious, but men who know their religion, who enter into it, who know just where they stand, who know what they hold; who know their Creed so well that they can give an account of it; who know so much history that they can defend it. I want an intelligent well-instructed laity. I wish to enlarge your knowledge, to cultivate your reason, to get an insight into the relation of truth to truth; to learn to view things as they are; to understand how faith and reason stand to each other: what are the bases and principles of Catholicism.

Those were precisely the aims Canon Sheehan sought to advance. Half a century had elapsed between Cardinal Newman's efforts to found his ideal university and Canon Sheehan's attempts to popularize the same ideal through his novels. It was a period which witnessed the rapid advance of Liberalism, industrialism, secularism and the spirit-blunting lust for power through money.

Canon Sheehan recognized the growth of these tentacles of monstrous materialism which have come in our time so near to strangling Christian civilization after having sucked the vitality from it. But these things did not by any means seem evil in his time. When we recall that he died in the year before the outbreak of World War I we know how unpopular his prophecies must have been to many who fully believed that commerce would bring peace to all the nations of the earth with the inevitability of a natural law, that the industrial revolution would solve the problems of social injustice it had itself created, that science would replace religion and financial security would supply the place of distintegrating Faith. The Canon saw it was a race against time to gain eternity. A vacuum had been left in the cultural life of his people between the gradual repeal of anti-Catholic laws and the time of their spiritual maturity. Into that vacuum an alien government was forcing an educational system calculated to pervert and paganize them. The popular press, with its crude exaltations of worldly success, violence, and all permutations of vice, was degrading a people whose native culture was tragically weakened through centuries of foreign domination.

All that we now group under the label of corrosive modernity Canon Sheehan sought to anticipate and counteract, at least on behalf of his countrymen, by linking up the Gaelic tradition with the splendid tradition of Catholic Europe. By reviving the deeply spiritual Celtic way of life and putting it into vitalizing contact with the great Catholic heritage as it expressed itself in Gregorian Chant and Gothic architecture, in the wisdom of Aquinas and the poetic vision of Dante, he hoped his people might bridge over the gap of tumult and temptation. He would fight modernity with mysticism and the debasing techniques of secularism with good taste. He has achieved a partial success. Ireland is still strong in the Faith, but the acids of modernity have begun their corrosive influences in her cities where the press and the movies continue to propagate the crude, elemental, materialistic attitudes to life of an alien civilization. There has been a tragic frequency of pathetic failures in Ireland's history, and too many chapters of her history have closed with a heart-rending "Too late."

The Gaelic language has revived considerably since Canon Sheehan's time, but the old Gaelic way of life has not flowered with it in any effective way. Ten months after the death of the pastor of Doneraile a war burst upon Europe which was to disintegrate and almost destroy the splendid Catholic traditions, the proud Christian heritages, to which he had hoped to link the Gaelic tradition for sustenance and support. We cannot foresee when the process of distintegration will be arrested, though we have sufficient faith in Europe to believe that she will recover her Christian vitality after some period of trial and purgation. And when earnest men search for patterns of Christian civilization on which to make fresh starts, in the English-speaking world many will seek to awaken enthusiasm for spiritual reconstruction through the novels of Canon Sheehan.

LIAM BROPHY

Dublin, Ireland

DUTIES OF MORAL THEOLOGIANS

Neither can the casuist afford to neglect the warnings of the public conscience. What it condemns he can scarce at any time safely allow; Christian righteousness cannot sink beneath secular morality. This is a wide-reaching principle not always sufficiently kept in view. Casuists who work out their problems on abstract principles are not unfrequently betrayed into concessions which the popular conscience condemns: yet the social verdict is a safer guide in all that concerns human interests, representing, as it does, a general estimate born of daily experience. But it must be the common judgment, not that of a few whose personal interests may lead them to exaggerate their rights, especially when sanctioned by law.

Still less should the casuist be bound, in laying down his lines, by the higher law of honor. For honor is one thing and conscience another. Honor varies considerably with times and places; morality is invariable, as based on the nature of things.

—Fr. John Hogan, S.S., in "Clerical Studies," *AER*, X, 2 (Feb. 1894), 132 f.

THE PARISH PRIEST AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS

It is hard to imagine how the work of our parishes could go on without the help of Sisters. We are so used to taking for granted that they will be on hand to teach in our schools, to direct and to carry on our hospitals and works of mercy, to teach catechism classes, act as sacristans, and perform all the other good works which call for their help, that we shrink from conjecturing what parish priests would do without the Sisters. When a new parish is established, and there is question of building a parish school, the first problem is "where shall we get the Sisters?" If they are not forthcoming, and in sufficient numbers, the parish priest is perplexed indeed.

Obviously a great deal of the success of parishes, and of the Church in general in our land, is due to the labor and sacrifices, prayers and devotion of our Sisters. If vocations to the sisterhoods were greatly to diminish, it would be necessary to re-adjust many of the vital activities of the parish. Lay people would have to be enlisted and paid. The financial burdens would be multiplied, and all those occupational hazards and perplexities which do not exist while the devoted Sisters work in their organized community, for so moderate a support, and with such complete devotion, would then arise to plague the pastor.

When our parish priests hear, therefore, of the need of more vocations, and read the surveys that the present writer has made, showing that the communities of Sisters are receiving only a fraction of the recruits they need, this spells a threat and a problem to every parish. If the day comes when there is an acute shortage of vocations, that will be a very sad day for those who are responsible for our parishes. Now, the surveys we have made and the studies we have been carrying on for quite a few years on this question have shown that there is a decided crisis in vocations to the sisterhoods in the United States.

This does not mean that great numbers of Catholic girls are not entering the novitiate. In point of fact, there are three times as many women giving themselves to the services of the Church, as there are men. But the great increase of the work of the Sisters, the many calls made upon them for new foundations and for more

Sisters to carry on the old, have resulted in a great shortage of Sisters, an acute need for many more recruits. Many pastors have already experienced the results of this shortage when they have applied for more Sisters, and have found that the community could not give all they asked. Others have been fortunate, so far, in getting the ones they wanted, but they are not so sure for the future. In any event, the time is coming when, unless more vocations are developed, many more parishes will suffer from a lack of enough Sisters.

But while a good many parish priests realize the personal angle of a shortage of vocations, so far as it concerns the interest of their parish, there may be a number who do not quite realize their own personal responsibility for encouraging vocations. It may even be that some would like to have a clearer idea of just what are the elements of a vocation of a Sister, and what is their personal opportunity and obligation in helping young people to follow their vocations.

By general consent, the parish priest is one of the most important figures in the vocation problem. His power is unique in encouraging and guiding young people who have a vocation. But also by general consent, he could sometimes do far more than he is at present accomplishing to enlighten and strengthen those whom God has called, and to help them to a lifelong happiness and service in religion.

We were very much interested in a report from a Conference recently held on this subject of vocations. It seems that one of the speakers strongly emphasized the lack of accurate knowledge, even in seminaries, of the true nature of a vocation. A great many are still beclouded with the old, mistaken notion that vocation is some sort of mystical experience, some nebulous sign from heaven. They lack the clear, definite, authentic knowledge of what a vocation really is, what it requires and how it can be recognized. The speaker who brought out these interesting observations also dwelt upon the fact that whereas priests are the official advisors, so to say, of young people who have vocations, and the latter are so often advised to "ask their confessors," and to "ask their priests," still a great many young people never have the advantage of the advice of a priest, but somehow manage to decide the matter of their vocation without it. To illustrate this, the speaker asked all those Sisters who were present, and who had been helped by a priest to follow their vocation, to hold up their hands. Out of an audience of over one thousand Sisters, only a few hundred held up their hands.

It would perhaps, in an article intended for priests, seem superfluous to describe in detail the elements of vocations. But a review is always helpful. Let us recall, therefore, that ever since the epoch-making book of the French abbé, which caused such a stir some generations ago, it has been very clear that the requirements for a religious vocation are merely these: sufficient health, good sense, the virtue required to lead a religious life; enough talent and education or experience to do the work of the community in question; a wish to enter the community—based on a supernatural motive, the love of God, the desire to save one's soul and other souls; and finally, acceptance by a religious superior. Anyone who has these requirements has a vocation. Nothing more is needed. The same elements, with the acceptance of a bishop substituted for that of a religious superior, are required and sufficient for a priestly vocation. No mystical experience, no feelings of piety and devotion, no sensible attraction are needed.

There is indeed a close parallel between the entrance into a profession and entrance into the religious life, though the motives may be so different in either case. A young man who wishes to be a lawyer has to present to the authorities of the law school proof that he is qualified to profit by his studies, and his entrance into law school is somewhat like his entrance into the religious novitiate. When he has proved himself by passing his examinations, which entitle him to admittance to the Bar, he is accepted by the civil authorities and enrolled on the list of those who are qualified to practice. This corresponds to the final acceptance of a superior and the taking of the vows. Thus, also, the processes of becoming a soldier or a doctor, or even a degreed professor show great points of similarity to the process of following a vocation. The motive in the one case, however, is usually a worldly one; the motive of the religious must be supernatural.

These considerations make it much easier for the parish priest to give encouragement and guidance to the young people who apply for help in deciding a vocation. They also are an aid in determining which young women he ought to encourage to think about the religious life. If the applicant has good health, good sense, a good disposition and piety and training enough to succeed as a Sister, and is moved with a desire to join a community for supernatural motives, she ought to be encouraged. One can never have a moral certainty that she will succeed, but a reasonable probability is enough to justify entering the novitiate. Then the superiors of the community will have an opportunity to decide as to her fitness, and she herself can learn all she needs to know about the community and its work and the religious life in general before she takes her vows.

Much depends on the attitude of the individual priest toward religious vocations for women. Pastors who have great esteem for the religious life, who are convinced that it is the best and happiest way of life for women, who think with the Church in her esteem of the entire consecration of body and soul to Christ, which religious life makes possible, will be most energetic and successful in encouraging vocations.

The personal appreciation they have of the excellence and the merit of this life will communicate itself to the young people with whom they deal. They will be inclined to advise those who seem to have a fitness for the religious state to enter the novitiate as soon as practicable. To those who are misled by the too-common notion, "perhaps I can do more good in the world," they will explain frankly that the religious life is a sure and systematic devotion of one's entire being to Christ and to souls, whereas even very good people who live in the world are necessarily limited in the direct work they can do for Him.

Some priests are famous for their interest and helpfulness and so young people naturally come to them for advice and guidance in this most important matter. They have the consolation of knowing that many of their spiritual daughters are leading happy and helpful lives in the holy precincts of the convents, hospitals, and schools. They know full well also that these dear souls may have their share of difficulties and trials to make them more like Christ, their Beloved. But they also know that women in the world have much worse difficulties and afflictions without the strength and consolations which come from an entire religious consecration to Christ's service and imitation. Many grateful prayers follow them from many cloisters. When they die, they leave behind them faithful intercessors who will never rest until they have delivered them from purgatory. In years to come, old, holy Sisters will recall with grateful love the help that Father gave them when they were young, inexperienced, perplexed, attracted by the world, it may be, but desirous to give their all to Christ.

When priests like these apply to the superiors of the religious communities for more Sisters to help them in the parish, the school, the hospital, they may do so without embarrassment or the fear that the Sister Superior may be thinking to herself "how many good Sisters has this Father helped to join our Community?" They will never regret hearing of the later misfortunes in the lives of those whom they might have helped to enter the convent. Not of them will the aged and regretful women in the world tell of the discouragement or lack of sympathy for which they blame the fact that they never followed their religious vocation.

The years during which a priest is engaged in his active ministry, especially in a parish, are usually full of opportunities to help and encourage religious vocations. No one can tell before hand just what boy may succeed in being a good and successful priest, or what girl may achieve the holy vocation of a Sister, but the priest in the parish can carry on a general and tactful apostolate by explaining vocation thoroughly and rightfully, by making known the unique merit and happiness of giving oneself all to God. Since from the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh, the priest who is full of love of vocations and zeal for their fulfillment will find opportunity for many observations, little remarks and illustrations which without obtrusiveness or stuffiness show his own immense appreciation of a vocation, and encourage others to think of it and to pray for it as for a great treasure.

Just as parents in their home can best encourage vocations in their children by showing their own deep faith and hope and love and their sincere appreciation of the dignity and excellence of the priestly and the religious life, so may the priest in his daily talk, in his sermons, in his conversations with the young people of his parish, show his own esteem for the priestly and the religious vocation, and his desire that those of his dear young people who have the fitness and the courageous love, may become priests or Sisters and thus bring a great blessing on their own families, on the parish and on the Church and the world.

The parish priest may likewise help vocations by inviting members of religious communities or recruiters from the mission dioceses in our own and other lands, to speak to the children of his parish. These vocation talks may not seem to have any immediate effect, but they may plant the seeds which will grow and blossom into vocations in after years. An old Sister once recalled to me that her whole desire and determination to follow the religious life came from a remark made during a sermon, in which the priest compared the espousals of a Sister with Christ to the wedding of an earthly king. He said that if some great prince should visit our land to select a bride, the girls of the nation would be thrilled with anticipation and would envy the fortunate one. The heart of this young girl was moved by the comparison, and she became a devoted Sister. She labored for many years for many parishes.

Another way, of course, is by having vocational literature at hand, where the young people can readily read it or carry it away. A thorough knowledge of the religious life, its opportunities, its merits, its dignity, is a great help to a young soul to make the decision to leave all and follow Christ. Well-written and interesting devotional literature may easily be had, and if it finds its way into the Catholic homes of the parish, the young people will be able to inform themselves about the religious life in its various aspects.

In his talk with his brother-priests, the parish priest, and every other priest for the matter of that, can do much to encourage his fellows to work for vocations. He will find very few priests who do not appreciate the services of the Sisters. But there are some who, while they are grateful for the help given them by the Sisters, are not so enthusiastic about helping toward the increase of vocations. Sometimes, one or two incidents, not necessarily characteristic or of general occurrence, may have caused them to grow cool about encouraging vocations. Or, perhaps the realization of their own part and responsibility in the guidance of the young souls who are called by God has not come home to them. In either event, some tactful and earnest talk on the part of a brother-priest may help to kindle them with the same appreciation and desire that he has, to help the young people to follow Christ.

A long experience has made us think that many priests are hardly aware of their own latent powers, of the immense potential influence which they can have on others. Catholics especially, who believe by divine faith that the priest is Christ's chosen ambassador, listen to him with special attention and acknowledge his unique authority. They are thus in his power to a degree that must move and arouse the generous zeal of a true priest to do them all the good that he can, by word and by work. But to the young people, he can be an oracle of the Holy Spirit, gently and kindly helping them to understand and follow that soft and gentle invitation which Christ is whispering in their hearts: "Come, come, follow Me!"

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S.J.

New York, N. Y.

THE FATHERHOOD OF ST. JOSEPH

It is true that there are certain similarities between Joseph's fatherhood and that of an ordinary human adoptive father. Neither of these two relationships implies physical generation of the child by the parent in question; and both relationships imply mutual duties and rights, as well as the acceptance of the son by the father. The discrepancies, however, are far more momentous than these points of agreement. The outstanding difference between a human adoptive father and St. Joseph is this: an adopted son is a stranger or alien to the marriage of his adoptive parents, or to one of them. He does not possess a natural right of inheritance. Yet Jesus was by no means alien to the marriage of Joseph and our Lady. The very purpose of the virginal union as determined by God was that it should prepare for our Lord's coming, should receive Him in its midst, and should rear Him to adult manhood.

—Fr. Francis L. Filas, S.J., in *Joseph and Jesus* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), p. 156.

INFALLIBILITY IN THE ENCYCLICALS

Cardinal Louis Billot was certainly one of the greatest ecclesiologists of the generation just past. There are many who consider him the ablest writer on the treatise *de ecclesia* since the time of the Vatican Council. Fr. Joachim Salaverri, of the Jesuit faculty of theology in the Pontifical Institute of Comillas in Spain, holds very much the same position in the theological world of the mid-twentieth century that Cardinal Billot occupied in that of fifty years ago.

In general, the scientific tendencies manifest in Fr. Salaverri's work are much the same as those that appeared in the writings of his distinguished predecessor. In several instances, the teaching of Fr. Salaverri actually appears as a legitimate and laudable development of the doctrine set forth in Billot's volumes on the Church. Yet, on one important and highly practical point, their opinions are diametrically opposed. That point is the statement of the exact doctrinal value of teaching presented explicitly, unconditionally and directly in papal encyclical letters.

Thus it is the contention of Fr. Salaverri that "in doctrinal encyclical letters directed to the entire Catholic world, the doctrine which is taught *assertive et principaliter* is rightly proposed by theologians as something which must be held *simpliciter* as *doctrina catholica*."[1]

I have retained some of the key Latin terms in this statement by Fr. Salaverri because of their basic importance for any accurate understanding of his teaching. Thus a doctrine which is taught *assertive* is obviously something set forth unconditionally, without qualification. I make an assertion when I state that something is true. It is not an assertion, not a declaration made *assertive,* when I say that it would seem that something is true, that there are reasons for holding that it is true, or that it is not safe to hold that it is untrue. In other words, the assertion is the form in which a man ordinarily expresses a certain and definitive, as distinct from a merely opinionative or tentative judgment.

---

[1] Salaverri, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* Lib. 2, cap. 2, art. 3, n. 664, in the *Sacrae Theologiae Summa,* edited by the Jesuit professors in the theological faculties of Spain, Vol. I, by Salaverri and Nicolau (2nd edition, Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1952), 698 f.

In its context, the word "principaliter" carries a twofold meaning. A doctrine taught *principaliter* in a papal encyclical letter is one which the Holy Father manifestly intended to bring out in this document. It is thus something set forth *data opera,* and not as a mere *obiter dictum.* Moreover, it is the meaning primarily signified or expressed in any given statement, as distinct from the more or less immediate inferences which may legitimately be drawn from that declaration.

So it is that, according to Fr. Salaverri, the immediate, certain, and direct content of a teaching, set forth in definitive form by the Holy Father in one of his doctrinal encyclical letters, is rightly designated as *simpliciter doctrina catholica.*

Now Fr. Salaverri has included two different definitions of *doctrina catholica* in his treatise on the Catholic Church. As he explains it, *doctrina catholica* in the strict sense of the term *(stricte),* is "that which the universal *magisterium* teaches in a merely authoritative manner *(mere authentice),* by an act which is of true doctrinal authority but which does not exclude the possibility of error."[2] Catholic doctrine *in genere,* on the other hand, is "that which is taught by the universal *magisterium* either infallibly or in a merely authoritative manner."[3]

It seems obvious that what Fr. Salaverri means by *doctrina catholica simpliciter* is identical with that which he designates as *doctrina catholica stricte.* Thus, he actually teaches that what the Popes set forth as direct and unconditional assertions in their encyclical letters must be accepted by Catholics as authoritative but definitely not as infallible doctrine.

Cardinal Billot, on the other hand, took an entirely different view of the matter. He held that the *ex cathedra* definition, described by the Vatican Council, is not the only kind of declaration in which the Holy Father exercises his charism of infallibility.

He sedulously distinguished two different kinds of acts of the pontifical *magisterium.* One kind, of course, is the *ex cathedra* definition or declaration, which is always protected by the charism of doctrinal infallibility. The other kind are not definitions in the strict sense of the term, according to the Cardinal, because they do not contain any new dogmatic judgment. He found examples of this latter sort of pontifical doctrinal statement "in very many encyclicals of the recent Pontiffs, wherein, exercising their apostolic function, they expound Catholic doctrine, but not as issuing definitions, that is, not as bringing in a new doctrinal judgment, but rather as instructing the faithful in those things that are in the preaching of the Church, the column and the foundation of the truth." He adds, however, that "although it would seem entirely beyond doubt *(nullatenus dubitandum)* that the Pontiffs are infallible in documents of this kind which are sent to the universal Church (and certainly with regard to what is said in them *directe et per se,* as has been said in like manner elsewhere), still we cannot find in these that *locutio ex cathedra* which the Vatican Council has in mind."[4]

---

[2] Salaverri, *op. cit.*, n. 892, p. 784.

[3] *Op. cit.*, n. 893, p. 784.

Objectively, then, it seems clear that what Cardinal Billot means by the teaching presented *directe et per se* in the papal encyclical letters is completely identical with what Fr. Salaverri describes as brought out *assertive et principaliter* in these same documents. Cardinal Billot regards it as quite certain that the Sovereign Pontiffs act infallibly in proposing such statements. Fr. Salaverri, on the other hand, seems to consider it unquestionable that, in expressing these judgments, the Popes are acting authoritatively but not infallibly. It is, I believe, a matter of vital importance that our theologians today should take steps to see which of these two great authors is in the right on this particular subject.

The process of investigation should not be overly difficult. There are certainly plenty of doctrinal encyclicals available for study, and we have no lack of norms for use in distinguishing the infallible teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff from that portion of his doctrinal message which is truly authoritative without being infallible in character. Yet, as far as the encyclical letters and certain other utterances of the Holy Father's own ordinary *magisterium* are concerned, it is only all too clear that no great corporate effort has yet been made to apply these norms, and to try to see what is and what is not infallible in the doctrinal content of these documents.

---

[4] Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi, sive continuatio theologiae de Verbo Incarnato* (5th edition, Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), I, 656.

Most of the time it would seem that the existence or the non-existence of infallible teaching in the encyclical letters has been treated as an assumption rather than as a conclusion. Thus, considering only the examples of the two theologians whom we have already cited in the course of this article, Fr. Salaverri seems merely to assume that what is asserted directly in encyclical letters is authoritative and non-infallible in character, while Cardinal Billot seems likewise only to assume that in making these statements the Holy Father exercises his charism of infallibility. Each presents his opinion on this subject only incidentally.

Cardinal Billot states his belief in the course of his examination of the elements included by the Vatican Council in its explanation of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. Fr. Salaverri, on the other hand, brings his opinion on the subject into his explanation of the thesis that "an internal and religious assent of the mind is due to the doctrinal decrees of the Holy See which have been authentically approved by the Sovereign Pontiff." Neither theologian offers anything like an adequate and direct backing for his own view on the relation of infallible teaching to the encyclical letters.

Nevertheless, if we examine the pertinent theological literature, we shall find that there are certain truths and assumptions which are more or less tacitly considered as arguments or as the foundations of arguments against the existence of infallible teaching in the encyclical letters. It goes without saying, of course, that we are concerned here with the infallibility or non-infallibility of statements which are made authoritatively only in the encyclicals themselves, or in some other document of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium*. It is obvious that, should the Holy Father, in one of his encyclicals, quote some definition of an oecumenical council or some solemn dogmatic definition proposed by himself or by one of his predecessors in the Roman Pontificate, he is uttering an infallibly true statement. Quite manifestly, a previous infallible definition of the Church loses nothing of its infallible character through being quoted in an encyclical letter or in some other utterance of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium*. The point at issue was and remains the question as to whether a statement contained in an encyclical letter, and proposed in an authoritative manner in no other document of the Church's *magisterium*, can be accepted as not only authoritative but infallible in character.

What may be considered as the principal arguments militating against the existence of such infallible teachings in the encyclical letters can, I believe, be summed up under these four headings:

1) The encyclicals are documents of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium,* and the Holy Father does not exercise his charism of infallible doctrinal decision in the ordinary *magisterium.*

2) The Holy Father teaches infallibly only when he speaks *ex cathedra,* and the encyclical letters are not *ex cathedra* documents.

3) The Holy Father has the power to speak authoritatively in doctrinal matters without using his charism of infallibility, and the encyclical letters are documents in which he speaks in this way.

4) The Code of Canon Law states explicitly that "nothing is understood to be declared or defined dogmatically unless this be manifestly certain," and what is stated only in encyclical letters is not manifestly and certainly defined in a dogmatic manner.

It is my belief that even a brief examination of these arguments will actually bring out rather serious evidence in support of the very thesis against which they are generally employed. Fundamentally none of them gives any adequate ground for the teaching that the encyclicals do not contain statements which must be accepted as infallibly true on the authority of the encyclicals themselves.

First of all, there is the question of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium.* Interestingly enough, Fr. Salaverri does not base his position on any denial of the possibility of infallible teaching within the compass of the Pope's ordinary doctrinal activity. He teaches clearly and firmly that the Holy Father can teach infallibly in his ordinary, as well as in his solemn or extraordinary, *magisterium.*[5]

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that there are some theologians who hold that an *ex cathedra* definition, the kind of declaration which the Vatican Council described in its definition of the Holy Father's doctrinal infallibility, is necessarily a solemn or extraordinary doctrinal act.[6] Cardinal Billot and Fr. Salaverri, strangely enough, agree on this point.[7] They likewise agree, moreover, that the Holy Father can teach infallibly other than in an *ex cathedra* declaration.[8] They differ in that Cardinal Billot includes what is taught explicitly and directly in encyclical letters within the compass of this infallible but not *ex cathedra* teaching, while Fr. Salaverri definitely excludes this material.

---

[5] Cf. Salaverri, *op. cit.,* nn. 647 f., pp. 692 f.

[6] For example, Yves de la Brière, *L'Église et son goûvernement* (4th edition, Paris: Grasset, 1935), p. 30; Charles Héris, *L'Église du Christ: son sacerdoce: son goûvernement* (Juvisy, France: Cerf, 1930), p. 41; Msgr.

Now one very serious argument that has been alleged against the possibility of infallible teaching within the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium* has been taken from the text of the encyclical letter *Humani generis* itself. The now-famous twentieth paragraph of that document has been interpreted in such a way as to make it seem to exclude the possibility of infallible teaching in the ordinary papal *magisterium*, or at least in the encyclical letters.

The Latin text of this paragraph reads as follows:

> Neque putandum est, ea quae in Encyclicis Litteris proponuntur, assensum per se non postulare, cum in iis Pontifices supremam sui Magisterii potestatem non exerceant. Magisterio enim ordinario haec docentur, de quo illud etiam valet: "Qui vos audit, me audit" (*Luc.* 10;16); ac plerumque quae in Encyclicis Litteris proponuntur et inculcantur, iam aliunde ad doctrinam catholicam pertinent. Quodsi

---

Cesare Manzoni, *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae* (4th edition, Torino: Berruti, 1928), I, n. 378, p. 225; and Bishop Hilarinus Felder, *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis* (2nd edition, Paderborn, 1923), II, 266 f. Ludwig Lercher, in his *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (2nd edition, Vienna, 1933), I, n. 498, p. 519, says that some people call the Holy Father's authoritative but non-infallible *magisterium* his ordinary *magisterium*. Lercher himself seems to approve of this designation. Fr. Edmond D. Benard of the Catholic University also supports the contention that an *ex cathedra* definition is always a solemn pronouncement in his paper "The Doctrinal Value of the Ordinary Teaching of the Holy Father in View of *Humani Generis*," published by The Catholic Theological Society of America, in its *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention*, pp. 78-107. Fr. Antoine Chavasse not only holds that the Holy Father teaches infallibly solely in solemn or *ex cathedra* pronouncements, but shows a bitter animus against theologians who presume to defend the opposite opinion. Cf. his essay "La véritable conception de l'infaillibilité papale," in the symposium *Église et unité* (Lille: Catholicité, 1948), pp. 80 f.

[7] Cf. Billot, *op. cit.*, I, 655 ff.; Salaverri, *op. cit.*, n. 643, p. 692; n. 648, p. 693. It is to be noted that Cardinal Billot does not teach this thesis explicitly, but that, from the examples of an *ex cathedra* definition he gives, it is apparent that he understands it as always a solemn pontifical judgment.

[8] Cf. Billot, *op. cit.*, I. 656; Salaverri, *op. cit.*, n. 648, p. 693.

> Summi Pontifices in actis suis de re hactenus controversa data opera sententiam ferunt, omnibus patet rem illam, secundum mentem ac voluntatem eorumdem Pontificum, quaestionem liberae inter theologos disceptationis iam haberi non posse.[9]

The English translation of the *Humani generis* issued by the NCWC renders the first part of this paragraph as: "Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: 'He who heareth you, heareth me.' . . ."[10]

In the brilliant paper which he read to the sixth annual meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America in Detroit in 1951, Fr. Edmond D. Benard noted that the NCWC translation takes no cognizance of the word "etiam" in the second sentence of the paragraph in question, and went on to say that "The obvious sense of the Holy Father is that even though the Ordinary Magisterium is not the supreme exercise of the Teaching Power, to the Ordinary Magisterium *also* may be applied the words, 'He who heareth you, heareth me.' "[11]

If we are to retain the commonly accepted teaching that the supreme apostolic doctrinal power of the Sovereign Pontiff is exercised only and always in one of his infallible doctrinal statements, then it would certainly appear that Dr. Benard interprets the text of *Humani generis* as denying the existence of infallible doctrinal declarations or decisions in the documents of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium.* Such an interpretation, however, seems to be based ultimately on two presumptions, neither of which can easily be verified. In the first place, this interpretation rests apparently on the assumption that, in the first sentence of the twentieth paragraph in the *Humani generis,* the "cum" clause expresses actual Pontifical teaching. In the second place, it depends upon the belief that the word "etiam" distinguishes the "magisterium ordinarium" of the second sentence from the "suprema Magisterii potestatem" of the previous sentence.

---

[9] This text is found in *The American Ecclesiastical Review (AER)* CXXIII, 5 (Nov., 1950), 389.

[10] NCWC translation, p. 10.

[11] Benard, *op. cit.*, p. 90, note 22.

It would seem that the grammatical structure of the first sentence and the mentality of the encyclical itself both militate against the probability that the "cum" clause in this sentence is to be taken as an expression of the teaching of the Holy Father himself. This first sentence is, in effect, an order, manifestly forbidding the faithful to hold a definite belief. The forbidden tenet is either one of two things. It is simply "the things proposed in encyclicals do not demand assent of themselves," or it is the complete statement that "the things proposed in encyclical letters do not demand assent of themselves because the Popes do not employ their supreme doctrinal power in these documents."

If the "cum" clause had been put between "neque" and "putandum," the first and second words of the opening sentence, then that clause would manifestly have been the expression of papal teaching. Then it would have been unmistakably clear that the Holy Father intended to say that he does not use the supreme power of his teaching authority in writing encyclical letters. But when the clause is placed, as it actually has been, at the end of the sentence, it can at least equally well be interpreted, not as an expression of Pontifical teaching, but rather as a part of the statement which the encyclical itself condemns.

Incidentally, the official Italian translation of the *Humani generis,* published in the same issue of *L'Osservatore Romano* in which the Latin text itself first appeared, supports this last interpretation. It renders the word "cum" in the first sentence of the twentieth paragraph of this encyclical with the expression "col pretesto."[12] The Vatican translator himself obviously considered the "cum" clause not as an expression of the Holy Father's own teaching, but rather as a part of the statement which the document forbade the faithful to hold.

It must be observed, however, that the *Humani generis* certainly does not mean to condemn, and must not be interpreted as condemning, the notion that the Popes do not exercise their supreme doctrinal authority in the encyclical letters. This condemnation affects the statement only as a reason alleged by some Catholics as an explanation of their failure to accept teachings contained in the encyclicals on the authority of the encyclicals themselves. The

---

[12] *L'Osservatore Romano* for Aug. 21-22, 1950, p. 2.

Humani generis says nothing, one way or another, about the truth or falsity of this statement considered by itself. It is impossible to prove either the existence or the non-existence of infallible teachings in the encyclical letters from the text of the *Humani generis*.

There is likewise serious reason to believe that the word "also," in the second sentence of this twentieth paragraph, is not used to set the notion of the ordinary papal *magisterium* apart from that of the supreme power of the papal teaching authority. In the official documents of the Church itself, as well as in the literature of Catholic theology, the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church and of the Sovereign Pontiff is customarily mentioned as something distinct from the solemn or extraordinary teaching activity. It is at least quite probable that such is the meaning intended here in the text of the *Humani generis*. It is surely as likely that the encyclical means to say that, in the ordinary *magisterium* as well as in the solemn, the words of Our Lord find valid application, as it is that this document implies that these words are true with respect to the ordinary *magisterium* as well as with reference to the exercise of the supreme pontifical doctrinal authority. Thus the twentieth paragraph of the *Humani generis* does not support a denial of infallible teaching in the encyclical letters.

The second reason commonly alleged against the existence of infallible teaching in the papal encyclicals is founded on the twofold contention that the Holy Father speaks infallibly *only* when he issues a definition or declaration *ex cathedra* and that a statement in a papal encyclical cannot be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.

Both Cardinal Billot and Fr. Salaverri oppose the first of these statements. Both are convinced that there are infallible doctrinal statements issued by the Holy Father which do not lend themselves to classification as *ex cathedra* judgments. It is in line with this conviction that Cardinal Billot was willing to admit the existence of infallible teachings in the papal encyclicals, which he did not consider to be *ex cathedra* documents.

Yet a good number of theologians hold firmly that there is no such thing as an infallible pontifical statement which is not an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.[13] To me it seems that their position is absolutely correct. Moreover, I do not believe that the Vatican Council's description of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement in any way excludes the possibility of such a statement in an encyclical letter or in any other act of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium*.

---

[13] Thus, Lercher, *loc. cit.*, Manzoni, *loc. cit.*, and Benard, pp. 80 f.

The description of the *ex cathedra* definition is to be found in the Council's solemn declaration of the dogma of papal infallibility.

> . . . We teach, and we define it to be a divinely revealed dogma, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, exercising his function as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines on his supreme apostolic authority a doctrine about faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, enjoys, through the divine assistance promised to him in the Blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished His Church to be equipped in defining doctrine about faith or morals; and that therefore the definitions of the same Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by reason of the consent of the Church.[14]

Thus, according to the teaching of the Vatican Council itself, the Holy Father speaks infallibly when he issues a definition *ex cathedra*, and he issues a definition *ex cathedra* when the following conditions are verified:

A) He speaks in his capacity as the ruler and teacher of all Christians.

B) He uses his supreme apostolic authority.

C) The doctrine on which he is speaking has to do with faith or morals.

D) He issues a certain and definitive judgment on that teaching.

E) He wills that this definitive judgment be accepted as such by the universal Church.

There are many excellent theologians today who tend to believe, with Cardinal Billot and Fr. Salaverri, that the Vatican Council's description of an utterance *ex cathedra* applies only to a solemn or extraordinary act of the Holy Father's *magisterium*, and who are convinced, as a result, that the above description could never fit any teaching set forth in one of the papal encyclicals. Yet even a brief examination of the various elements which the Vatican Council noted as characteristic of an *ex cathedra* papal statement will, I think, serve to show that there is inherent weakness in this position.

---

[14] *DB*, 1839.

Obviously the first of these conditions is fulfilled in the encyclical letters. These are documents which the Sovereign Pontiff sends out to the episcopate of the Church universal either directly or indirectly. Most of the encyclicals are, as a matter of fact, sent directly to the Catholic episcopate of the entire world. Others, those sent to the episcopate of one country or region, are promptly entered into the *Acta* of the Holy Father, and are thus indirectly sent, as normative documents, to the faithful of the entire world.

The same, it should be noted, can be said of those allocutions and other papal instructions, which, though primarily directed to some individual or group of individuals, are then printed in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* as directives valid for all of the Church militant. We must not lose sight of the fact that, in the encyclical *Humani generis*, the Holy Father made it clear that any doctrinal decision printed in the pontifical *Acta* must be accepted as normative by all theologians.[15] This would apply to all decisions made in the course of the Sovereign Pontiff's ordinary *magisterium.*

The second condition requisite for the issuance of an *ex cathedra* and infallible pontifical definition may likewise be verified in the Holy Father's encyclical letters and in the other acts of his ordinary *magisterium.* This is the use of the Pope's supreme apostolic doctrinal authority.

In itself, the apostolic doctrinal authority is nothing else than the power to issue doctrinal judgments which the followers of Jesus Christ Our Lord are obligated in conscience to accept with a sincere, internal, and religious assent. The supreme apostolic doctrinal authority, which can be exercised only by the Holy Father himself or by the apostolic *collegium* of which he is the divinely constituted head, is the power to issue an irrevocable and definitive doctrinal judgment on matters of faith or morals, which decision the faithful are bound in conscience to accept with an absolute and irrevocable assent. If that supreme power is exercised within the field of dogma itself, that is, by declaring that some particular truth has been revealed by God and is to be accepted by all men as a part of God's revealed message, then the assent called for by the definition is that of divine faith itself. If, on the other hand, the Holy Father, using this supreme apostolic authority, does not propose his teaching as a dogma, but merely as completely certain, then the faithful are bound to accept his teaching as absolutely certain. They are, in either case, obliged in conscience to give an unconditional and absolutely irrevocable assent to any proposition defined in this way.

---

[15] "Quodsi Summi Pontifices in actis suis de re hactenus controversa data opera sententiam ferunt, omnibus patet rem illam, secundum mentem ac voluntatem eorumdem Pontificum quaestionem liberae inter theologos disceptationis iam haberi non posse." Par. 20, in *AER,* CXXIII, 389.

In other words, when we examine the matter closely, what I have listed as the second of the five conditions requisite for the existence of an *ex cathedra* pontifical doctrinal decision turns out to be not a distinct condition at all. It is necessarily present whenever and wherever the other four elements are to be found. Whenever the Holy Father speaks precisely as the spiritual ruler and the supreme authoritative teacher of the universal Church militant, dealing with matters concerning faith or morals, and definitively settling some point hitherto controverted or subject to controversy, in such a way that the faithful are bound to accept this definitive decision for what it is, then certainly he is using the supreme apostolic doctrinal power he has received from the divine Head of the Church.

If any of the other four conditions for an *ex cathedra* utterance should be wanting, then there is definitely no use of the Sovereign Pontiff's supreme apostolic doctrinal power. But, where these other four conditions are verified, the Holy Father is by that very fact speaking *ex cathedra,* speaking from the Roman chair of Peter, to instruct the flock which Our Lord has entrusted to his care. It would be unthinkable that the Vicar of Christ could speak, in his official capacity to the entire Church militant, on a matter of faith or morals, definitively settling a question by a decision which he wishes to constitute as irrevocable and which he commands the faithful to accept as irrevocably and absolutely true, without being protected by his charism of doctrinal infallibility.

Thus circumstantial solemnity, as such, has no absolutely necessary connection with the infallibility of a pontifical definition. That solemnity, of course, is a good and glorious thing within the Church of God. Those who saw and heard the Holy Father solemnly define the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven know from happy experience the spiritual good engendered by an act of this kind. Yet it remains obvious that the visible head of the universal Church militant does not require or depend upon such solemnities in order that he may speak effectively and infallibly to the flock for which he is responsible to Christ.

The third condition can be and is surely verified in the doctrinal encyclicals. It would be extremely difficult to deny that these documents deal with matters of faith or morals.

The fourth condition can be and, it would seem, not infrequently, is, verified also in the papal encyclical letters. It is, however, a condition which demands very close examination.

It is, I believe, to be presumed that the Vicar of Christ speaks to the faithful in a way they are able to understand. If he is proposing something as morally certain, as a statement which, though quite firm as it is now proposed, may still possibly turn out to be erroneous, it is to be presumed that he will, in his very expression of that statement, bring out its ultimately conditional character. If, on the other hand, he makes an absolutely unqualified assertion about some matter that concerns faith or morals, it would seem that he should be presumed to be presenting a teaching that is definitive and irrevocable. That, at least, would seem to be the presumption or line of conduct most consistent with the presentation of truth, and with the reception of doctrine in the Catholic Church.

In other words, if we examine the content and the immediate implications of the Vatican Council's teaching on an *ex cathedra* or infallible papal definition, it appears that the Council had nothing to say about the more or less solemn character of the papal document in which a teaching is set down, but had everything to say about the quality of the judgment or decision rendered by the Holy Father in the course of his teaching. What is required for the issuance of an *ex cathedra* judgment is a pontifical definition, an absolutely definitive and irrevocable decision on some point which had hitherto been subject to free discussion among Catholic theologians. In any infallible papal teaching it goes without saying, the absolutely definitive and irrevocable character of that decision must be apparent.

It is quite clear that one way in which these qualities may be apparent is through the use of the solemn formulae employed in dogmatic bulls and constitutions. But it is also clear that these solemnities need not be employed for every absolutely certain and definitive decision issued by the Sovereign Pontiff. Any man who is teaching, and who is setting forth some doctrine which, though "morally certain," might still turn out to be incorrect, will present his teaching for what it is. He certainly will not be in a position to propose such a doctrine in an absolutely unconditional categorical statement, particularly when he is a teacher who is recognized as competent to propose infallibly true doctrine.

The fifth and last condition indicated by the Vatican Council as requisite for an *ex cathedra* papal definition is that the Sovereign Pontiff should show that he intends to bind all the faithful to accept his definitive and irrevocable decision by an absolutely certain and irrevocable assent. There has, it would seem, been a certain amount of misleading discussion about this condition. Sometimes the Catholic scholar is led to believe that for every doctrinal statement by the Holy Father, there must be a definite warning or command that this statement is to be accepted with firm and sincere inward assent by all the faithful. They are likewise led sometimes to imagine that there could be no such thing as an infallible definition by the Holy Father without an explicit and solemn accompanying warning that this decision is to be accepted by all with an absolutely unwavering assent.

The fact of the matter is that every doctrine taught by the Holy Father in his capacity as the Vicar of Christ must, by the very constitution of the Church militant of the New Testament, be accepted by the faithful for what it is. If it is an infallible declaration, it is to be accepted with an absolutely firm and irrevocable assent. If it is a non-infallible statement, it must be accepted with a firm but conditional mental assent.

Actually there is no such thing as a teaching issued by the Holy Father in his capacity as the spiritual ruler and teacher of all the followers of Jesus Christ which is other than authoritative. Our Lord did not teach in any way other than authoritatively, nor does His Vicar on earth when he teaches in the name and by the authority of his Master. Every doctrine proposed by the Holy Father to the entire Church militant is, by that very fact, imposed upon all the faithful for their firm and sincere acceptance.

Hence, if we find in an encyclical letter, or, for that matter, in any document of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium* which has been registered in his official *Acta,* a doctrinal declaration proposed precisely as morally certain, all of the faithful owe to that declaration a full and morally certain assent or adherence. If, on the other hand, we find in these same documents some teaching set forth absolutely without qualification, either directly, or through the unqualified condemnation of its contradictory as heretical or as erroneous, it would seem to follow that all Christians are bound to give that proposition an absolutely certain and irrevocable assent.

Thus it would appear that there is nothing whatsoever in the Vatican Council's explanation of an *ex cathedra* declaration by the Holy Father which could be said to militate against the presence of such *ex cathedra* pronouncements in the papal encyclical letters. If we are to follow the directions of the Council, we shall look for infallible pontifical teachings, not by examining the solemnity of the documents in which these teachings are set down, but by considering the expression of the teachings themselves as they have been proposed by the Vicar of Christ.

The third formula used as an argument against the presence of infallible teachings in the papal encyclical letters may be expressed in this way: "The Holy Father has the power to teach authoritatively but without using his charism of doctrinal infallibility, and the encyclical letters are documents in which he teaches in this way."

Scientific theological discussion of the authoritative but non-infallible *magisterium* of the Holy Father has been carried extensively on only since the days of Pope Pius IX. The immediate sources of our knowledge of this matter are to be found in the teachings of the *magisterium* itself. There is, however, a highly pertinent and important theological teaching introduced by Cardinal Franzelin and developed by Fr. Palmieri and by Cardinal Billot. We shall first consider the documents of the *magisterium* which speak of authoritative but non-infallible teaching by the Holy Father to the Church.

There are, of course, several pronouncements by the Holy See with reference to the assent due to teachings set forth by various Roman Congregations or by the Pontifical Biblical Commission, with the approval of the Sovereign Pontiff himself. It goes without saying that such teachings are not guaranteed by the papal charism of doctrinal infallibility. The assent due to teachings of this sort is manifestly firm, sincere, internal, and religious in character. It is not, however, absolutely irrevocable.

We are concerned here, however, with teachings proposed by the Holy Father himself, and not those given to the Church, with his approval, by the various agencies of the Roman Curia. Several statements of the *magisterium* are commonly cited by theologians as having reference to authoritative but non-infallible teaching issued by the Soveregn Pontiff himself.

The letter *Tuas libenter,* written by Pope Pius IX on Dec. 21, 1863, to the Archbishop of Munich, is often cited as the first pontifical document to deal at any length with the matter of the ordinary *magisterium.* It does not contain, however, anything like a direct teaching on the existence or non-existence of infallible teaching in the papal encyclicals. It warns Catholic scholars that they must take cognizance of dogmas proposed by the ordinary *magisterium* of the Catholic Church as well as of those defined "by explicit decrees of the oecumenical councils or of the Roman Pontiffs and of this See." Furthermore, it calls attention to the fact that these scholars are bound in conscience to accept and to reverence the doctrinal decisions proposed by the Pontifical Congregations as well as those "held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths, and as conclusions which are so certain that, although opinions opposed to these points of doctrine cannot be characterized as heretical, they still deserve another theological censure."[16]

Thus the *Tuas libenter* in referring to the doctrinal acts of the Holy Father speaks only of those which are, in effect, dogmatic definitions. It takes no cognizance whatsoever of any teaching emanating from the Sovereign Pontiff himself, which could be designated as other than infallibly true.

The famous encyclical *Quanta cura* is likewise quoted from time to time on the matter with which we are concerned. Like the *Tuas libenter,* it has, however, no direct reference to any non-infallible teaching proposed by the Holy Father himself. The *Quanta cura* vigorously condemns the teaching that, "without sin and without any damage to a man's profession as a Catholic, assent and obedience can be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See which have as their object a reference to the general good of the Church and its rights and discipline, as long as this refusal does not affect dogmas of faith and morals."[17] Evidently here, as well as in the *Tuas libenter,* Pope Pius IX set out to condemn a Catholic minimism which would restrict the fields of necessary doctrinal obedience in the life of the faithful to the region of explicit statements of dogma alone. The doctrine of the *Quanta cura* has no immediate reference to the existence or non-existence of infallible teachings in the encyclical letters.

---

[16] *DB,* nn. 1683 f.

The famous *monitum* appended to the Vatican Council's dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius* is more to our point. The Council ruled that "Since the avoidance of heretical wickedness is not sufficient unless there is also a careful avoidance of those errors which more or less closely approach to it, we warn all of their obligation to observe also the Constitutions and the Decrees in which such evil opinions as have not been explicitly reproved here are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See."[18]

Vacant believes that the *Constitutiones* envisaged in this *monitum* are documents issued by the Holy Father or by an oecumenical council, while the *decreta* are issued either by the Holy Father or by one of the congregations of the Roman Curia.[19] Thus, among the *decreta* envisioned by the Council in this *monitum,* there are certainly some which are not presented with the charism of doctrinal infallibility. But, once again, there is no question here of any document of doctrinal import emanating from the Holy Father and bearing an authoritative but non-infallible character. The matter is simply not discussed in this place.

There is, however, one passage in the famous encyclical *Immortale Dei,* issued by Pope Leo XIII on Nov. 1, 1885, which is directly pertinent to our material. Pope Leo intended to show the individual Catholic what his duties were "tam in opinionibus quam in factis," with reference to the lessons contained in the *Immortale Dei* and in similar documents issued by the Holy See. In the field of intellectual judgment *(in opinando),* as distinct from the field of activity itself, "it is necessary to hold whatever the Roman Pontiffs have taught or are going to teach as accepted with firm assent and to profess these things openly whenever the occasion requires it."[20]

---

[17] *DB,* 1698.

[18] *DB,* 1820.

[19] Cf. Vacant, *Études théologiques sur les constitutions du Concile du Vatican: La constitution Dei Filius* (Paris and Lyons, 1895), II, 335.

The great Pontiff then went on to apply this principle directly to the main points brought out in the *Immortale Dei*. What he has said is to be understood "*nominatim* about the things called the liberties sought in most recent times." With reference to these, he insisted, "it is necessary for all to stand by the judgment of the Apostolic See, and that all must judge as it has judged *(et quod ipsa senserit, idem sentire singulos)*."[21]

Does this passage in the *Immortale Dei* teach that all the doctrinal points proposed authoritatively in encyclical letters must be accepted by all Christians, but only as opinions, and not as infallibly certain truths? Does it imply that all the doctrines about modern freedom contained in papal documents are presented in such a way as to leave room for the possibility of error?

I believe that a careful examination of the passage in question will show definite and manifest evidence that both of these questions must be answered in the negative.

We must take cognizance of the fact that the Holy Father has distinguished, not between opinion and certitude, but between the realm of intellectual judgment and that of practical activity. There is a definite standard to be followed or observed with reference to all the lessons taught authoritatively by the Holy See. That standard comes down to the axiom, "Sentire cum Ecclesia." It is valid in the realm of opinion, as well as in that of moral certitude and in the field of absolute certitude. The Holy Father's teaching about opinions implies, *a fortiori*, the same instruction with regard to teachings which are proposed, not as opinions, but as certainties. The Holy Father insists that all the faithful must accept as their own tenets the doctrines which are set forth in pontifical documents.

The *Immortale Dei*, then, cannot correctly be interpreted as teaching or as implying that all of the teachings presented in vehicles of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium* are limited to the realm of opinion. It would seem, however, that it does clearly imply that some of these teachings are to be classified as opinative in character.[22] The Holy Father's letters are clear enough. What he wills the faithful to accept sincerely and firmly as an opinion is obviously marked as an opinion in its very expression in the very document containing the instruction. Rather obviously, it would seem, the unqualified and absolute statements contained in these documents are not to be accepted as opinions at all, but as really certain judgments.

---

[20] *DB*. 1880.

[21] *Ibid*.

The Decree *Lamentabili sane exitu* calls attention to the fact that the Church can rightly command the faithful to accept its judgments and condemnations with an internal assent.[23] The encyclical *Humani generis* speaks of the necessity of accepting the papal teachings, and states that, once the Holy Father has placed in his official *Acta* some judgment or decision about a matter which has hitherto been controverted, that subject must no longer be considered as open to debate among Catholic theologians.[24] Nowhere, however, is there the slightest trace in the documents of the Church's *magisterium* of any assertion or implication that truths proposed explicitly and without qualification in the encyclical letters or in other vehicles of the Holy Father's doctrinal activity are to be accepted by the faithful merely with moral certainty, as teachings which may possibly turn out to be incorrect.

There is, of course, a highly important body of theological teaching about doctrines which are presented in the Church's *magisterium* as authoritative but not as infallibly true statements. The man who first developed this portion of sacred theology to any great extent was Cardinal Franzelin. The Cardinal, developing the teaching of the great eighteenth-century Jesuit theologian Francesco Zaccaria, distinguished between a *veritas infallibilis* and an *infallibilis securitas* in doctrinal statements emanating from the Roman Pontiff. He claimed that "the man who would deny this distinction between the ultimate definitive judgment of the Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* and the other doctrinal provisions and prohibitions would be forced to hold all the edicts of the Holy See which pertain in any way to doctrine indiscriminately as definitions *ex cathedra."*[25]

---

[22] Salaverri, *op. cit.*, n. 674, p. 702, opposes the contention of Schiffini who taught that doctrines proposed by the authoritative but non-infallible *magisterium* are to be accepted as opinions. He and the authors with whom he agrees prefer to call a conditioned but firm assent by the name of moral or practical certitude. The text of the *Immortale Dei*, however, gives some backing to the contention of Schiffini.

[23] *DB*, nn. 2007 f.

[24] *Humani generis*, *loc. cit.*

As Cardinal Franzelin described it, the authority of doctrinal providence (the source of the infallibility of security within the Catholic Church) had reference to doctrines which could or could not be held safely by the faithful.[26] Fr. Salaverri, however, agrees with Palmieri and De Groot in teaching that this truly authoritative though non-infallible doctrinal power of the Holy See can envisage teachings, not merely as safe, but as true and as morally certain.[27] In this, it would seem, he is perfectly correct.

Yet the unquestionable existence of an *auctoritas providentiae doctrinalis* should not be allowed to distract our attention from the central and essential fact that, when the Sovereign Pontiff issues an absolutely unqualified decision on a matter which has hitherto been a subject of legitimate debate among the theologians of the Catholic Church in an authoritative document addressed directly or indirectly to the universal Church militant, there is no reason to assign this decision merely to the realm of doctrinal providence or security. An absolutely unqualified decision in such a document calls for an *adequate* acceptance on the part of the faithful. It is difficult to see how that adequate response could be a conditioned judgment, even though such a judgment might be qualified as practically or morally certain. And, in the doctrinal life of the true Church, an absolutely irrevocable or unconditioned response is tendered only to a teaching given or proposed infallibly.

It does not seem that the statement in the Code of Canon Law can properly be used as an objection against the presence of infallible teaching in the papal encyclicals. What the Code declares is that "nothing is to be understood as declared or defined dogmatically unless this be manifestly certain."[28] There is nothing at all in this statement which could legitimately be taken to imply that manifest certainty of infallible definition is never to be found in the papal encyclicals.

---

[25] Franzelin, *Tractatus de divina traditione et scriptura* (2nd edition, Rome, 1875), pp. 127 f.

[26] Cf. Franzelin, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

[27] Cf. Salaverri, *op. cit.*, n. 677, p. 703.

[28] Canon 1323, § 3.

Indeed, there is good reason to believe that, in actual practice, Catholic scholars accept the unqualified and authoritative judgments or decisions expressed in the encyclicals as absolutely true, rather than as merely morally or practically certain. The *Mystici Corporis* taught the identity of the Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ.[29] It condemned the doctrine of a twofold Church, the one visible and the other invisible.[30] It taught the conditions for membership in the Church.[31] The *Humani generis* repeated the teaching about the identification of the Catholic Church with the Mystical Body.[32] These truths, as a group, have not been proposed authoritatively other than in the encyclicals. Yet, because the practice of our theologians frequently runs ahead of their theorizing, there would be very few teachers in the Catholic Church who would represent these teachings as other than absolutely and infallibly true.

There is another highly interesting testimony in this direction. Previous articles in this review have called attention to a statement in the *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici* of His Eminence Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani. Fr. Benard dealt with that statement at some length in his paper, "The Doctrinal Value of the Ordinary Teaching of the Holy Father in View of *Humani generis*."[33]

Cardinal Ottaviani, in the second edition of his *Institutiones,* published in 1935, classified the teaching that bishops receive their power of jurisdiction immediately from the Roman Pontiff as

---

[29] "Iamvero ad definiendam describendamque hanc veracem Christi Ecclesiam—quae sancta, catholica, apostolica, Romana Ecclesia est—nihil nobilius, nihil praestantius, nihil denique divinius invenitur sententia illa, qua eadem nuncupatur 'mysticum Iesu Christi Corpus.'" *Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS),* XXXV, 199.

[30] "Quapropter funestum etiam eorum errorem dolemus atque improbamus, qui commenticiam Ecclesiam sibi somniant, utpote societatem quandam caritate alitam ac formatam, cui quidem—non sine despicientia—aliam opponunt, quam iuridicam vocant." *AAS,* XXXV, 224.

[31] "In Ecclesiae autem membris reapse ii soli annumerandi sunt, qui regenerationis lavacrum receperunt veramque fidem profitentur, neque a Corporis compage semet ipsos misere separarunt, vel ob gravissima admissa a legitima auctoritate seiuncti sunt." *AAS,* XXXV, 202.

[32] Paragraph 27, in *AER,* CXXIII, 5 (Nov., 1950), 391.

[33] Cf. Benard, *op. cit.,* pp. 105 f.; and Fenton, "The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals," *AER,* CXXI, 149 f.; 210 f.; "The *Humani Generis* and the Holy Father's Ordinary *Magisterium,*" *AER,* CXXV, 61 f.

"probabilior, immo etiam communis."[34] In 1943 the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* appeared, and in it an absolutely unqualified description of episcopal authority as "immediate sibi [episcopis] ab eodem Pontifice Summo impertita."[35] The third edition of Cardinal Ottaviani's work, published in 1947, took cognizance of the teaching set forth in the *Mystici Corporis*. In this third edition the thesis is described as "hucusque considerata probabilior, immo communis, nunc autem ut omnino certa ex verbis Summi Pontificis Pii XII."[36] It goes without saying that a decision which is conditioned, which is only morally or practically certain, which admits the possibility of error, could never be qualified as *omnino certa*.

The attitude manifest in the *Institutiones* of Cardinal Ottaviani is one which follows the actual instruction of the Holy Father and which faithfully pays attention to the Holy Father's teaching. It is not an attitude which tends to minimize the unequivocal and unconditioned statements of Christ's Vicar, addressed in encyclical letters to the entire Church militant, by acting on the assumption that such teachings cannot be more than practically certain, or that they must be subject to the possibility of error. In terms of the dispute we have been considering, it is an attitude towards the doctrinal value of papal encyclicals more in line with the opinion of Cardinal Billot than with that of Fr. Salaverri.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[34] Ottaviani, *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici* (2nd edition, Vatican City, 1935), I, 461.

[35] *AAS*, XXXV, 212.

[36] Ottaviani, *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici* (3rd edition, Vatican City, 1947), I, 413.

Answers to Questions

LEGACIES FOR MASSES AND THE LAWYER'S DUTY

Question 1: Sometimes a Catholic leaves a large amount of money in his will as stipends for Masses to be applied for his soul or the souls of his relatives, without stipulating whether the Masses should be low or sung, or whether the number of Masses is to be determined according to the stipend prescribed for the diocese or according to a more generous amount. In such a case may the priest who receives the legacy celebrate High Masses (at the regular stipend for such Masses) from at least some of the legacy, or even presume that the testator intended to manifest special generosity, and accordingly take an amount greater than the stipulated stipend for each low Mass?

Question 2: Would it not be helpful if Catholic lawyers and law students were instructed to urge those persons whose wills they draw up to be very definite in expressing their intention on the number and the liturgical form of the Masses they wish celebrated?

Answer 1: The Code of Canon Law prescribes: "If a person has offered a sum of money for the celebration of Masses without indicating the number of the Masses, this is to be computed according to the stipend of the place in which the donor was abiding, unless his intention must legitimately be presumed to have been different" (Can. 830).

An even more detailed decision on the question was given by the Sacred Congregation of the Council on June 15, 1928, in response to questions proposed by an Ordinary of the United States:

> I. Whether, in interpreting wills in which a sum of money is left for the celebration of Masses, nothing being said in the will about the nature of the Masses, the beneficiaries may interpret the mind of the testator in favor of sung Masses, or not?
>
> II. Whether, when a testator has left a sum of money for the celebration of Masses, but nothing is said in the will as to the number of Masses, the beneficiary may take from the inheritance the sum of two dollars for each low Mass, or not?

Reply: The Sacred Congregation, after maturely considering everything, replied: *In the negative* to both questions; unless peculiar circumstances seem to advise the contrary; in which case recourse should be had for proper interpretation of the mind of the testator to this Sacred Congregation (Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* II, p. 206).

The final phrase of this reply indicates that the Sacred Congregation of the Council is prepared to assume the responsibility of interpreting the mind of the testator when there are good reasons to believe that he was willing to have the Masses celebrated in the ways mentioned by the questioner.

Answer 2: The suggestion made by the questioner is excellent. Catholic lawyers and law students should be instructed to explain to those who wish to leave legacies for Masses that they should be most definite as to the number and the liturgical nature of the Masses they wish celebrated. This will help to relieve priests to whom such legacies are transmitted of the uncertainty which often surrounds such bequests.

A SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR'S OBLIGATION OF SECRECY

Question: If the spiritual director of a seminarian finds out from the young man's own admission (made extrasacramentally to the director in his capacity as such) that the youth is utterly unworthy of advancement to Holy Orders, but despite that fact intends to seek admission to the priesthood, is the director permitted, for the sake of the common good, to reveal the fact to the proper authorities?

Answer: The spiritual director is bound by a *secretum commissum*—the strictest type of secret—not to reveal what is communicated to him by the seminarians in his capacity as their director. There are occasions in which a person is allowed to manifest even a committed secret, especially when the common good is at stake. However, the case described is not one of these occasions, because far greater harm would be done to the common good if a director could reveal what has been committed to him confidentially than would be prevented if he revealed the secret information given him by the unworthy aspirant to Holy Orders. If this were permissible many clerics would hesitate to make a sincere manifestation of their spiritual difficulties to their director, with the result that their guidance would be greatly hampered, and many more unsuitable individuals might be admitted to the priesthood than would be admitted if the violation of the secret were forbidden.

Fr. Nicholas Gill, C.P., thus solves the problem in his doctoral dissertation:

> It is true that an evil would be prevented by a word to the superior, but a revelation of such a matter is soon recognized or suspected by others, and sometimes the fact of disclosure becomes even generally known, with the result that the Spiritual Prefect would bring down opprobrium upon himself and his office, and the succeeding classes of religious students for many years would choose to keep their problems to themselves. As a consequence many would not receive the direction and the solution of spiritual difficulties which otherwise they would have received (*The Spiritual Prefect in Clerical Religious Houses of Study* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945], pp. 108-109).

Father Gill confirms his solution by a quotation from the Encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii* in which Pope Pius XI declares that confessors and spiritual directors of seminarians may not take any outward action to prevent an unworthy candidate from receiving Holy Orders "since that is severely forbidden them by their most delicate office itself, and often also by the inviolable sacramental seal."

It stands to reason that the spiritual director will do all in his power to persuade the young man to withdraw from the clerical state. A confessor, in the circumstances described, would be bound to refuse absolution. But such persuasion, in addition to fervent prayer, is the only means available, both to confessor and to director, to avert the harm that will probably come to the Church from the admission of an unworthy person to the ranks of the clergy.

THE MIXED MARRIAGE GUARANTEES

Question: A non-Catholic who married a Catholic girl in my parish, after giving the required promises to obtain the dispensation, now asserts that he is not bound to abide by these promises because he was *forced* to make them. What answer should be given to this claim?

Answer: This is an example of the deplorable dishonesty to which people sometimes have recourse in order to be free from an obligation that displeases them. The individual in question should be told that he was not forced to make the promises because he was not forced to marry the Catholic girl. The Church granted the favor of a dispensation on condition that the two parties gave the guarantees stipulated in Canon 1061. No pressure was exerted on them to enter the marriage; on the contrary, the Church would have preferred that it did not take place. The non-Catholic who pleads that he was *forced* to sign the promises is as unreasonable as a man who contracts with a tailor for a suit of clothes, and after receiving the garments complains that he is being *forced* by the tailor to pay him a sum of money.

Since the attitude in question seems to be growing among non-Catholics who have married Catholics, it might be advisable for a priest who receives the mixed marriage promises to ask the non-Catholic explicitly if he feels he is being *forced* to give the guarantees. If he admits that this is his attitude, there can hardly be present the moral certainty of the fulfillment of the guarantees which the Code demands as a condition for the granting of a dispensation (Can. 1061, § 1,3).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CORRECTION

Recently we were asked in this column about the Requiem Mass to be read on the occasion of an anniversary and in particular an anniversary in the broad sense. In the response we should have stated that for a priest the Requiem Mass read *in anniversario,* whether in the strict sense or in the wide sense, is the first Mass of All Souls' Day with the oration, secret and post-communion *pro defuncto sacerdote* taken from the *Orationes Diversae.*

ABSOLUTION AFTER REQUIEM MASS

Question: Is there any obligation to have the absolution after the daily Requiem Mass? I have noticed the catafalque arranged in neighboring churches and wonder about the obligation.

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites informs us that the absolution is not of obligation after the daily or anniversary Mass of Requiem but we are free to follow local custom in this regard.

PURIFYING THE COMMUNION PLATE

Question: When the priest returns to the altar after the distribution of Holy Communion during Holy Mass does he purify the communion plate into the ciborium or into the chalice?

Answer: After the priest has returned to the altar he places the ciborium into the tabernacle and only after that does he purify the communion plate. He never purifies the communion plate into the ciborium except when he distributes Holy Communion outside of Mass.

DISPOSAL OF BLESSED WATER

Question: Would you kindly tell me if the unused water blessed in a Mass for the living at the offertory is poured into the sacrarium? If so, is it *decet, licet, debet* or is it forbidden completely?

Answer: Custom has established that the water remaining in the cruet from Mass be poured into the sink in the sacristy. Certainly, we do not pour this water into the sacrarium since that has a very definite purpose. The water poured into the sacrarium is that used for the first washings of the corporals, palls, etc. Or again it is the water from the ablution cup after a priest has binated or purified his fingers once he has distributed Holy Communion. None of the authors makes mention of the disposal of the water retained in the cruet after Holy Mass. Certainly if there were any regulation that this water should be poured into the sacrarium mention of this fact would be emphasized.

RESPONSORY PROBLEMS

Question: At a *Missa recitata* or Dialogue Mass does the altar boy refrain from making the normal responses since the congregation answers the celebrant? At a Solemn High Mass does the deacon make the responses that the choir sings, e.g., at the Preface?

Answer: In the regulations given for the Dialogue Mass it says that the rubrics of the Mass must be followed. By definition the Dialogue Mass is one in which the congregation joins with the server in making the short responses and joins with the celebrant of the Mass in reciting those parts normally sung by the choir at a High Mass. At a Solemn High Mass the deacon does not make the responses that are sung by the choir.

CHRISTMAS CUSTOMS

Question: During the recent Christmas season I observed two customs that I submit for your consideration. At one church I saw an antique music box on the gradine of the altar and during low Mass this gave forth the traditional yuletide carols. At another church, on Christmas eve, there was a procession of children, dressed as angels, and the last young girl in the procession carried an infant which was placed by the young lady on top of the tabernacle. I am told this remains there until January 13.

Answer: Customs of this sort are pure sentimentality and should be forbidden. Where does this leave the Mass, we might ask ourselves? The top of the tabernacle does not become a catch-all, and we priests should be the first to recognize the proper regulations in such matters and bring home to our people the real, genuine meaning of Christmas.

FORTY HOURS' THRONE

Question: In regard to Forty Hours' Adoration is it permissible to use the top of the tabernacle for exposition? If so, should there be a canopy over the monstrance since we do not have a baldachin over the altar? We have a stained glass window above our sanctuary and we wonder if this meets all the requirements. Also, our Forty Hours' Devotion falls during Lent. May we have Benediction and repose the Blessed Sacrament in order to have the Stations of the Cross for our school children and again expose after the Stations have been finished?

Answer: For exposition at any time if the top of the tabernacle is used the crucifix must not be removed and the monstrance set in its place. To follow the regulations set down as regard exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, an additional canopy is not necessary if there is a baldachin or canopy over the entire altar. It is difficult to see just how a stained glass window in the ceiling of the sanctuary over the altar fulfills the requirement of a canopy or baldachin.

We are never allowed to give Benediction during Forty Hours' Devotion except when there is question of reposition at the end of the day where exposition does not continue throughout the night. It is strictly forbidden and entirely out of place to interrupt exposition and give Benediction for some private devotion ordinarily observed on this or that particular day of the week which happens to coincide with the Forty Hours' Devotion.

ASSISTANT PRIEST AT PONTIFICAL MASS

Question: What is the proper dress for an assistant priest at a Pontifical High Mass when said priest is not a member of the papal household?

Answer: When a priest acts as assistant priest to a Bishop at a Pontifical High Mass he wears a surplice over his cassock or habit, an amice and then the cope but never the stole. Some priests make the mistake of wearing the amice under the surplice but this is entirely incorrect.

ORATIO PRO PATRE ET MATRE

Question 1: Is a priest at the Funeral Mass of his parents free to use either the Oratio *Pro patre (matre)* or the oration from the Funeral Mass, *Deus cui proprium est*? The latter prayer is directed more specifically to the state of the soul in the hour of judgment and a priest might prefer to use this prayer for his parents.

Question 2: The Oratio *Pro patre (matre)* that a priest reads or sings in the Funeral or Requiem Mass for his parents allows the use of "mei" or "nostri." Does he use the "mei" when he is the only child and "nostri" if he has brothers and sisters?

Answer 1: Normally we use the oration designated in the Mass for the day of burial. Father O'Connell does add this in a footnote: "Probably a prayer from the *Orationes Diversae,* which, in a particular case would be a really proper prayer (e.g., that for the father or mother of Celebrant) might be used."

Answer 2: A priest is free to use "mei" or "nostri" according to the intention he formulates in his own mind. If he wishes to unite with his own intention that of his brother or sister or whoever may be present he uses the plural form. Otherwise, he keeps the single form.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE PRIEST'S DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

The priest, moreover, needs the special grace of God to enable him to fulfill the arduous duties which he has undertaken in the priesthood. This grace, it is true, is given him in the sacrament of Holy Orders. But this sacramental grace often lies dormant in the soul, and needs to be awakened, resuscitated, actuated. Hence the Apostle exhorts his beloved disciple Timothy not to neglect this grace: "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands in the priesthood;" and in another place he bids him arouse this grace within him: "I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands." There certainly is no better means of arousing and actuating this grace of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the priest than the living communion with the Sacred Heart—that intimate converse in which we listen to the pulsations of the Divine Heart, drink in its sentiments and reproduce them in our own hearts.

—Fr. James Conway, S.J., in "Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus," *AER,* XIII, 4 (Oct. 1895), 285.

Analecta

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI
PII
DIVINA PROVIDENTIA
PAPAE XII

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA

De disciplina servanda quoad ieiunium eucharisticum

PIUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

Christus Dominus, "in qua nocte tradebatur" (*I Cor.* 11, 23), cum postrema vice veteris Legis celebravit Pascha, coena facta (cfr. *Luc.* 22, 20), accepit panem, et gratias agens fregit, deditque discipulis suis dicens: "Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur" (*I Cor.* 11, 24); itemque calicem eis porrexit asseverans: "Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur" (*Matth.* 26, 28), "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem" (cfr. *I Cor.* 11, 24-25). Quibus ex Sacrarum Litterarum locis omnino patet Divinum Redemptorem ultimae huic paschali celebrationi, in qua agnus ex Hebraeorum ritibus manducabatur, voluisse substituere novum Pascha, ad saeculorum usque obitum permansurum, esum videlicet immaculati Agni, immolandi pro mundi vita, ita ut novum Pascha novae Legis Phase vetus terminaret, et umbram fugaret veritas (cfr. hymn, *Lauda Sion* [Missale Rom.]).

Quandoquidem autem utriusque coenae eiusmodi coniunctio idcirco habita fuit, ut ex antiquo Paschate ad novum significaretur transitus, facile perspici potest cur Ecclesia, in Eucharistico Sacrificio ex Divini Redemptoris iussu in eius commemorationem renovando, a veteris agapes more discedere potuerit, et Eucharisticum ieiunium in usum inducere.

Etenim inde ab antiquissima aetate consuetudo invaluit Eucharistiam christifidelibus ieiunis administrandi (cfr. Ben. XIV, *De Syn. Dioec.* 1. 6. c. 8, n. 10). Saeculo autem exeunte quarto iam in variis Conciliis ieiunium iis praecipiebatur, qui Eucharisticum celebraturi essent Sacrificium. Itaque anno CCCLXXXXIII Hipponense Concilium haec decrevit: "Sacramenta altaris non nisi a ieiunis hominibus celebrentur" (Conc. Hipp. can. 28: *Mansi,* III, 923); quod praeceptum paulo post, hoc est anno CCCLXXXXVII, ex Carthaginensi Concilio III iisdem verbis edebatur (Conc. Carth. III, cap. 29: *Mansi,* III, 885); ac saeculo ineunte quinto haec consuetudo satis communis et immemorabilis dici potest; quamobrem S. Augustinus affirmat sanctissimam Eucharistiam a ieiunis semper accipi itemque per universum orbem morem istum servari (cfr. S. August. *Ep. LIV ad Ian.* cap. 6: *Migne, PL,* XXXIII, 203).

Procul dubio haec agendi ratio gravissimis innitebatur causis, in quibus ea ante omnia memorari potest, quam Apostolus gentium lamentatur, cum de fraterna christianorum agape agit (cfr. *I Cor.* 11, 21 sq.). Etenim cibo potuque se abstinere cum summa illa reverentia congruit, quam supremae Iesu Christi maiestati debemus, cum eum Eucharisticis delitescentem velis sumpturi sumus. Ac praeterea, dum, ante quodlibet alimentum, eius pretiosissimo Corpore ac Sanguine vescimur, luculenter demonstramus illud esse primum ac summum nutrimentum, quo animus alatur noster eiusque augeatur sanctitas. Quapropter idem Augustinus haec monet: "Placuit Spiritui Sancto ut in honorem tanti Sacramenti in os christiani prius Dominicum Corpus intraret, quam ceteri cibi" (S. August. 1. c.).

Neque debitum solummodo honoris munus hoc ieiunium Divino tribuit Redemptori, sed pietatem etiam fovet; ideoque ad saluberrimos illos sanctitatis fructus augendos conferre potest, quos bonorum omnium fons et auctor Christus a nobis, gratia ditatis, elici postulat.

Nemo ceteroquin est, qui experiundo non agnoscat ex ipsis humanae naturae legibus contingere ut, cum corpus cibo oneratum non sit, mens erigatur agilior, atque impensiore moveatur virtute ad arcanum illud excelsumque meditandum mysterium, quod in animo, tamquam in templo, agitur, divinam adaugens caritatem.

Quanta cura Ecclesia Eucharisticum ieiunium servandum curaverit ex eo etiam erui potest, quod illud, gravibus quoque poenis violatoribus impositis, imperavit. Etenim Concilium Toletanum VII, anno DCXXXXVI, excommunicationem ei comminatum est, qui non ieiunus sacris fuisset operatus (Conc. Tolet. VII, cap. 2: *Mansi,* X, 768); anno autem DLXXII Concilium Bracarense III (Conc. Bracar. III, can. 10: *Mansi,* IX, 841), et anno DLXXXV Concilium Matisconense II (Conc. Matiscon. II, can. 6: *Mansi,* IX, 952) iam decreverant eum, qui huius rei evasisset reus, de sui muneris honorisque sede deponendum esse.

Attamen, volventibus saeculis, illud quoque diligenter consideratum est, interdum nempe esse opportunum, ob peculiaria rerum adiuncta, hanc ieiunii legem, ad christifideles quod attinet, aliquatenus relaxare. Quam ad rem Constantiae Concilium, anno MCCCCXV, dum eiusmodi sacrosanctam legem confirmat, addit quoque quoddam temperamentum: "... sacrorum canonum auctoritas, laudabilis et approbata consuetudo Ecclesiae servavit et servat, quod huiusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post coenam, neque a fidelibus recipi non ieiunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis aut alterius necessitatis a iure vel Ecclesia concesso vel admisso" (Conc. Constant. sess. XIII: *Mansi,* XXVII, 727).

Placuit haec in memoriam ea de causa reducere, ut omnes perspectum habeant Nos, quamvis novae temporum rerumque condiciones suadeant ut non paucas facultates ac venias hac in re concedamus, velle tamen per Apostolicas has Litteras summam huius legis consuetudinisque vim confirmare ad Eucharisticum quod attinet ieiunium; ac velle etiam eos admonere, qui eidem legi obtemperare queant, ut id facere pergant diligenter, ita quidem ut ii solummodo, qui in necessitate versentur, hisce concessionibus frui possint secundum eiusdem necessitatis rationes.

Suavissimo Nos solacio afficimur—quod libet heic, etsi breviter, declarare—cum pietatem cernimus erga Augustum altaris Sacramentum cotidie magis increbrescere non modo in christifidelium animis, sed ad divini cultus etiam splendorem quod pertinet, qui ex publicis populorum manifestationibus saepenumero emicat. Quam ad rem haud parum procul dubio contulere sollicitae Summorum Pontificum curae, ac praesertim Beati Pii X, qui quidem, ad priscam Ecclesiae consuetudinem renovandam omnes advocans, eos adhortatus est, ut quam creberrime, immo cotidie si possent, ad Angelorum mensam accederent (S. Congr. Concilii, Decretum *Sacra Tridentina Synodus,* d. d. XX mensis Decembris, an. MCMV: *Acta S. Sedis,* XXXVIII, 400 sq.); ac parvulos quoque ad caeleste hoc pabulum invitans, sapienti consilio statuit praeceptum sacrae Confessionis sacraeque Communionis ad eos singulos universos spectare, qui iam ad rationis usum pervenissent (S. Congr. de Sacramentis, Decretum *Quam singulari,* d. d. VIII mensis Augusti, an. MCMX: *Acta Ap. Sedis,* II, p. 577 sq.); quod etiam in iuris canonici Codice sancitum est (C. I. C. can. 863; cfr. can. 854, § 5). Hisce Summorum Pontificum curis christifideles ultro libenterque respondentes, ad sacram Synaxim frequentiores usque accessere. Atque utinam haec caelestis Panis fames divinique Sanguinis sitis in omnibus cuiusvis aetatis hominibus in omnibusque civium ordinibus exardescant!

Animadvertendum tamen est ea quibus vivimus tempora eorumque peculiares condiciones multa in societatis usum in communisque vitae actionem induxisse, ex quibus graves difficultates oriantur, quae possint homines a divinis participandis mysteriis abstrahere, si Eucharistici ieiunii legi eo prorsus modo ab omnibus obtemperandum sit, quo ad praesens usque tempus obtemperandum erat.

Imprimisque patet omnibus clerum hodie ingravescentibus christianorum necessitatibus numero imparem esse; qui quidem festis praesertim diebus nimium saepe laborem tolerare debet, cum serius Eucharisticum Sacrificium ac non raro etiam bis vel ter celebrare debeat, cumque interdum officio quoque teneatur longinquum faciendi iter, ut sacra ne desint haud parvis sui gregis partibus. Enervantes eiusmodi apostolici labores sacerdotum valetudinem procul dubio debilitant; idque eo vel magis quod non modo Missae litandae cum Evangelii explicatione, itemque sacris Confessionibus audiendis, catechesi impertiendae, ceterisque sui muneris partibus increscenti studio increscentique opera vacare debent, sed iis etiam rationibus rebusque diligenter prospicere ac consulere, quas asperum illud certamen adversus Deum eiusque Ecclesiam postulat, tam late hodie, tam callide acriterque excitatum.

At mens animusque noster ad eos potissimum advolat, qui procul a patria cuiusque sua, in longinquis operantes terris, huic Divini Magistri invitationi iussionique generosi responderunt: "Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes" (*Matth.* 28, 19); ad Evangelii praecones dicimus, qui gravissimis etiam exantlatis laboribus atque itinerum difficultatibus omne genus superatis, eo omni nisu contendunt, ut christianae religionis lumen omnibus pro facultate affulgeat, utque suos greges, saepenumero a catholica suscepta fide adhuc recentes, angelico illo enutriant cibo, qui virtutem alat pietatemque refoveat.

Iisdem fere in rerum adiunctis ii quoque christifideles versantur, qui vel in non paucis regionibus a catholicis Missionalibus excultis, vel in aliis locis commorantes, cum proprium apud se non habeant sacrorum administrum, alterius sacerdotis adventum in seras horas exspectare debent, ut Eucharisticum participare queant Sacrificium, seseque divino enutrire pabulo.

Ac praeterea, postquam machinae omne genus in usum inductae fuere, saepissime contingit ut opifices non pauci vel officinis, vel vehicularibus maritimisque muneribus, vel aliis publicae utilitatis officiis addicti, non modo per diem sed per noctem etiam alternis iteratisque laboris vicibus occupentur, ita quidem ut debilitatae eorum vires eos interdum compellere possint ad aliquid nutrimenti accipiendum, atque adeo iidem impediantur quominus ad Eucharisticam mensam ieiuni accedant.

Ad hanc eamdem mensam matres quoque familias saepenumero venire nequeunt, antequam domesticis curis prospexerint, quae multas saepe ab eis postulant laboris horas.

Parique modo evenit ut in puerorum puellarumque scholis ac litterarum ludis plurimi habeantur, qui divino illi invitamento respondere cupiant: "Sinite parvulos venire ad me" (*Marc.* 10, 14), cum fore omnino confidant ut ille, qui "pascitur inter lilia" (*Cant.* 2, 16; 6, 2) suum ipsorum animi candorem morumque integritatem contra iuvenilis aetatis illecebras ac mundi insidias tutetur; verumtamen perdifficile interdum iisdem est, antequam ad scholam se conferant, sacras adire aedes ibique sese Angelico enutrire Pane, postea vero domum redire ut necessarium suscipiant nutrimentum.

Hoc praeterea animadvertendum est saepe hodie contingere ut frequentissimae populi multitudines ex alio ad alium locum postmeridianis horis ea de causa transgrediantur, ut religiosas celebrationes, vel coetus de re sociali habendos participent; si igitur hisce etiam datis occasionibus liceat Eucharisticum peragere Mysterium, quod divinae gratiae vitalis fons est voluntatesque iubet ad virtutem adipiscendam exardescere, haud dubium est inde vim hauriri posse, qua omnes ad christiane penitus sentiendum operandumque excitentur, et ad legitimis etiam obtemperandum legibus.

Peculiaribus hisce considerationibus haec adicere opportunum videtur, quae ad omnes spectant; quamvis nempe nostris hisce temporibus ars medica ac disciplina illa, quae hygiene dicitur, tantos progressus fecerint, tantumque contulerint ad mortuorum numerum in puerili praesertim aetate minuendum, nihilo secius praesentis vitae condiciones atque ea, quae ex immanibus huius saeculi bellis consecuta sunt incommoda, eiusmodi sunt, ut non parum corporum constitutionem valetudinemque debilitaverint.

Hisce de causis, quo praesertim experrecta in Eucharistiam pietas facilius augeatur, e variis Nationibus Episcopi non pauci, officiosis datis litteris petiere, ut haec ieiunii lex aliquantulum mitigaretur; atque iam haec Apostolica Sedes peculiares hac in re facultates ac venias sacrorum administris ac christifidelibus benigne concessit. Ad quas concessiones quod attinet, memorare libet Decretum, quod *Post Editum* inscribitur, a S. Congregatione Concilii die VII mensis Decembris, anno MCMVI, pro infirmis datum (*Acta S. Sedis,* XXXIX, p. 603 sq.); ac Litteras die XXII mensis Maii, anno MCMXXIII, Locorum Ordinariis a S. S. C. S. Officii pro sacerdotibus datas (S. S. Congregationis S. Officii Litterae locorum Ordinariis datae super ieiunio eucharistico ante Missam: *Acta Ap. Sedis,* XV, p. 151, sq.).

Postremis hisce temporibus, Episcoporum hac de re petitiones crebriores impensioresque fuere, atque ampliores pariter fuerunt facultates concessae, eae potissimum quae belli occasione dilargitae sunt. Id procul dubio luculenter indicat novas, graves, non intermissas ac satis generales exstare causas, quibus nimis difficile sit, multiplicibus in rerum adiunctis, cum sacerdotes Eucharisticum sacrificium celebrare, tum christifideles Angelico vesci Pane ieiunos.

Quamobrem, ut gravibus hisce incommodis ac difficultatibus occurramus, utque indultorum diversitas in actionum discrepantiam ne cedat, necessarium ducimus Eucharistici ieiunii disciplinam ita mitigando statuere, ut, quam largissime fieri potest, in peculiaribus etiam temporum locorum ac christifidelium condicionibus, eiusmodi legi omnes obtemperare facilius queant. Haec Nos decernentes, fore confidimus ut haud parum conferre possimus ad Eucharisticae pietatis incrementum, atque adeo aptius permovere atque excitare omnes ad Angelorum participandam Mensam, adaucta procul dubio Dei gloria ac Mystici Iesu Christi Corporis sanctimonia.

Haec igitur omnia, quae sequuntur, Apostolica auctoritate Nostra decernimus ac statuimus:

I. Ieiunii eucharistici lex, a media nocte pro iis omnibus vigere pergit, qui in peculiaribus condicionibus non versentur, quas per Apostolicas has Litteras posituri sumus. Principium tamen generale et commune omnibus in posterum esto, sive sacerdotibus, sive christifidelibus: aquam videlicet naturalem Eucharisticum ieiunium non frangere.

II. Infirmi, etiamsi non decumbant, aliquid sumere possunt, de prudenti confessarii consilio, per modum potus, vel verae medicinae, exceptis alcoholicis. Eadem facultas sacerdotibus infirmis conceditur Missam celebraturis.

III. Sacerdotes, qui vel tardioribus horis, vel post gravem sacri ministerii laborem, vel post longum iter celebraturi sunt, aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus, exclusis alcoholicis; a quo tamen se abstineant saltem per spatium unius horae, ante quam sacris operentur.

IV. Qui autem bis, vel ter Missam celebrent, ablutiones sumere possunt, quae tamen, in hoc casu, non vino, sed aqua tantum fieri debent.

V. Christifideles pariter, etiamsi non infirmi, qui ob grave incommodum—hoc est, ob debilitantem laborem, ob tardiores horas, quibus tantum ad Sacram Synaxim accedere possint, vel ob longinquum iter, quod suscipere debeant—ad Eucharisticam mensam omnino ieiuni adire nequeant, de prudenti confessarii consilio, hac perdurante necessitate, aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus, exclusis alcoholicis; a quo tamen se abstineant saltem per spatium unius horae, antequam Angelico enutriantur Pane.

VI. Si rerum adiuncta id necessario postulant, locorum Ordinariis concedimus ut Missae celebrationem vespertinis, ut diximus, horis permittere queant, ita tamen ut haec initium non habeat ante horam IV post meridiem, sive in festis de praecepto, quae adhuc vigent, sive in illis quae olim viguerunt, sive primis uniuscuiusque mensis feriis sextis, sive denique in illis sollemnibus, quae cum magno populi concursu celebrentur, atque etiam, praeter hos dies, semel in hebdomada, servato a sacerdote ieiunio trium horarum quoad cibum solidum et potus alcoholicos, unius autem horae quoad ceteros potus non alcoholicos. In his autem Missis christifideles ad Sacram Synaxim accedere poterunt, hac eadem servata norma ad ieiunium Eucharisticum quod attinet, firmo praescripto can. 857.

Evangelii autem praeconibus, in territoriis Missionum, peculiarissimis perpensis condicionibus in quibus versantur, ob quas raro plerumque habentur sacerdotes, qui longinquas stationes invisere queant, Locorum Ordinarii eiusmodi facultates concedere poterunt ceteris etiam hebdomadis diebus.

Locorum tamen Ordinarii diligenter curent, ut quaelibet vitetur interpretatio, quae concessas facultates amplificet, utque ab omni abusu et irreverentia hac in re caveatur; in hisce enim dilargiendis facultatibus, quas hominum, locorum temporumque condiciones hodie postulant, Nos etiam atque etiam volumus Eucharistici ieiunii momentum, vim atque efficacitatem confirmare ad eos quod attinet, qui Divinum Redemptorem sub Eucharisticis velis latentem accepturi sunt. Ac praeterea, quotiescumque corporis incommodum minuitur, animus debet pro facultate rem supplere, sive interna paenitentia, sive aliis modis, ex tradito Ecclesiae more; quae quidem cum ieiunium mitigat, alia opera adimplenda imperare solet. Qui igitur datis hac in re facultatibus perfrui queant, impensiores ad Caelum admoveant preces, quibus Deum adorent, eidem grates agant, ac praesertim admissa expient novaque impetrent superna auxilia. Cum omnes perspectum habeant oporteat Eucharistiam "tamquam passionis suae memoriale perenne" (S. Thom. *Opusc. LVII,* Offic. de Festo Corporis Christi, lect. IV, *Opera Omnia,* Romae, MDLXX, vol. XVII) a Iesu Christo institutam fuisse, ex animis sensus illos eliciant christianae humilitatis christianaeque paenitentiae, quos Divini Redemptoris cruciatuum ac mortis meditatio excitare debet. Itemque eidem Divino Redemptori, qui, perpetuo in altaribus se immolans, maximum renovat sui amoris documentum, adauctos offerant omnes suae erga proximos caritatis fructus. Hac profecto ratione conferent omnes ad illud Apostoli gentium cotidie magis explendum: "Unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus, omnes qui de uno pane participamus" (*I Cor.* 10, 17).

Quaecumque autem hisce Litteris decreta continentur, ea omnia stabilia, rata ac valida esse volumus, contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus, peculiarissima etiam mentione dignis; atque abolitis ceteris omnibus privilegiis ac facultatibus, quomodocumque a Sancta Sede concessis, ut ubique omnes hanc disciplinam aeque riteque servent.

Quae quidem omnia, supra statuta, vim suam obtineant a promulgationis die per *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* factae.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo quinquagesimo tertio, die sexta mensis Ianuarii, in Epiphania Domini, Pontificatus Nostri anno quarto decimo.

PIUS PP. XII

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

OF HIS HOLINESS

POPE PIUS XII

Concerning the Discipline To Be Observed With Respect to the Eucharistic Fast

PIUS, BISHOP,

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

FOR AN EVERLASTING REMEMBRANCE

Christ the Lord "on the night in which He was betrayed" (*I Cor.* 11:23) when for the last time He kept the Pasch of the old law, after He had supped (cf. *Luke* 22:20) took bread and giving thanks broke, and gave to His disciples, saying: "This is My Body which shall be given up for you" (*I Cor.* 11:24); and He likewise presented the chalice to them saying: "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is being shed for many" (*Matt.* 26:28), "Do this in remembrance of me" (cf. *I Cor.* 11:24 f.). From these passages out of Holy Scripture it is completely obvious that our Divine Redeemer wished to substitute, in place of this final Passover ceremony in which a lamb was eaten according to the rite of the Hebrews, a new Pasch which would endure until the end of the world, that is, the eating of the Immaculate Lamb who was to be immolated for the life of the world. Thus the new Pasch of the new law put an end to the old Passover and the truth emerged from the shadow (cf. the Hymn "Lauda Sion" in the Roman Missal).

But since the conjoining of the two suppers was so arranged as to signify the transfer from the old Pasch to the new, it is easy to see why the Church, in renewing the Eucharistic Sacrifice at the command of the Divine Redeemer and in commemoration of Him, could depart from the custom of the ancient love-feast and introduce the Eucharistic fast.

From the very earliest time the custom was observed of administering the Eucharist to the faithful who were fasting (cf.

Pope Benedict XIV, *De synodo diocesano,* 6, cap. 8, n. 10). Towards the end of the fourth century fasting was prescribed by many Councils for those who were going to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice. So it was that the Council of Hippo in the year 393 issued this decree: "The Sacrament of the altar shall be offered only by those who are fasting" (Conc. Hipp., can. 28: *Mansi,* III, 923). Shortly afterwards, in the year 397, the Third Council of Carthage issued this same command, using the very same words (Conc. Carth. III, cap. 29: *Mansi,* III, 885). At the beginning of the fifth century this custom can be called quite common and immemorial. Hence St. Augustine affirms that the Holy Eucharist is always received by people who are fasting and likewise that this custom is observed throughout the entire world (cf. St. Augustine, Ep. 54, *Ad Jan.,* cap. 6: *Migne,* PL, 33, 203).

Doubtless this way of doing things was based upon very serious reasons, among which there can be mentioned first of all the one the Apostle of the Gentiles deplores when he is dealing with the brotherly love-feast of the Christians (cf. *I Cor.* 11:21 ff.). Abstinence from food and drink is in accord with that supreme reverence we owe to the supreme majesty of Jesus Christ when we are going to receive Him hidden under the veils of the Eucharist. And moreover, when we receive His precious Body and Blood before we take any food, we show clearly that this is the first and loftiest nourishment by which our soul is fed and its holiness increased. Hence the same St. Augustine gives this warning: "It has pleased the Holy Ghost that, to honor so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of the Christian before other foods" (St. Augustine, *loc cit.*).

Not only does the Eucharistic fast pay due honor to our Divine Redeemer, it fosters piety also; and hence it can help to increase in us those most salutary fruits of holiness which Christ, the Source and Author of all good, wishes us who are enriched by His grace to bring forth.

Moreover, everyone with experience will recognize that, by the very laws of human nature, when the body is not weighted down by food the mind more easily is lifted up and is by a more ardent virtue moved to meditate upon that hidden and transcendent Mystery which works in the soul, as in a temple, to the increase of divine charity.

The solicitude of the Church for the preservation of the Eucharistic fast may be perceived also from the fact that the Church, in decreeing this fast, imposed serious penalties for its violation. Thus the Seventh Council of Toledo in the year 646 threatened with excommunication anyone who should say Mass after having broken his fast (Conc. Tolet. VII, cap. 2: *Mansi,* X, 768). In the year 572 the Third Council of Braga (Conc. Bracar. III, can. 10: *Mansi,* IX, 841), and in the year 585 the Second Council of Macon (Conc. Matiscon. II, can. 6: *Mansi,* IX, 952) had already pronounced that anyone who incurred this guilt should be deposed from his office and deprived of his honors.

As time went by, however, on careful consideration it was sometimes judged opportune because of particular circumstances to relax in some measure this law of fasting as it affected the faithful. So it is that the Council of Constance, in the year 1415, while confirming the venerable law of fasting, somewhat moderated it: ". . . the authority of the sacred canons and the praiseworthy and approved custom of the Church have observed and do observe the following: that Mass should not be said after the celebrant has taken food, nor should Holy Communion be received by the faithful without fasting, unless in case of illness or of some other necessity conceded or admitted by right or by the Church" (Conc. Constant. sess. XIII: *Mansi,* XXVII, 727).

It has pleased Us to recall these things so that all may understand that We, despite the fact that new conditions of the times and of affairs have moved Us to grant not a few faculties and favors on this subject, still wish through this Apostolic Letter to confirm the supreme force of the law and custom dealing with the Eucharistic fast; and that We wish also to admonish those who are able to observe that same law that they should continue diligently to observe it, so that only those who need these concessions can enjoy them according to the nature of their need.

We are most effectively consoled—and it is right to speak of this here, even though briefly—when We see that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar is increasing day by day, not only in the souls of the faithful, but also in what has to do with the splendor of the divine worship, as has often been made evident in public popular demonstrations. The careful directions of Sovereign Pontiffs have doubtless contributed a great deal to this effect, and especially that of the Blessed Pius X who, summoning all to renew the primitive custom of the Church, urged them to receive the Bread of Angels very frequently, even daily if possible (S. Congr. Concilii, Decretum "Sacra Tridentina Synodus," Dec. 20, 1905: *Acta S. Sedis*, XXXVIII, 400 ff.). Inviting the little ones to this heavenly food, he wisely decreed that the precept of holy Confession and Holy Communion has reference to every one of those who have reached the use of reason (S. Congr. de Sac., Decretum "Quam singulari," Aug. 8, 1910: *AAS*, II, 577 ff.). This same rule is prescribed in the Code of Canon Law (CIC, can. 863; cf. can. 854, § 5). The faithful responding generously and willingly to these directions of the Sovereign Pontiffs, have approached ever more frequently to the sacred Table. May this hunger for the heavenly Bread and the thirst for the Sacred Blood burn in all men of every age and of every walk of life!

It should nevertheless be noted that the times in which we live and their peculiar conditions have brought many modifications in the habits of society and in the activities of common life. Out of these there may arise serious difficulties which could keep men from partaking of the divine mysteries if the law of the Eucharistic fast is to be observed in the way in which it had to be observed up to the present time.

In the first place, it is evident to all that today the clergy are not sufficiently numerous to cope with the increasingly serious needs of the faithful. Especially on feast days they are subject to overwork, when they have to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice at a late hour and frequently twice or three times the same day, and when at times they are forced to travel a great distance so as not to leave considerable portions of their flocks without Holy Mass. Such tiring apostolic work undoubtedly weakens the health of priests. This is all the more true because, over and above the offering of the Holy Mass and the explanation of the Gospel, they must likewise hear confessions, give catechetical instruction, devote ever-increasing care and take ever more pains in completing the duties of the other parts of their ministry. They must also diligently look after those matters that are demanded by the warfare against God and His Church, a warfare that has grown so widespread and bitter at the present time.

Now our mind and heart go out to those especially who, working far from their own native country in far distant lands, have generously answered the invitation and the command of the Lord: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations" (*Matth.* 28:19). We are speaking of the heralds of the Gospel who, overcoming the most troublesome and multitudinous labors and all manner of difficulty in traveling, strive with all their might to have the light of the Christian religion illumine all, and to nourish their flocks, who but very recently received the Catholic faith, with the Bread of Angels which nourishes virtue and fosters piety.

Almost in the same situation are those Catholics who, living in many localities cared for by Catholic missionaries, or who, living in other places and not having among them their own priests, must wait until a late hour for the coming of another priest that they may partake of the Eucharist and nourish themselves with the divine food.

Furthermore, since the introduction of machines for every sort of use, it very often happens that many workers—in factories, or in the land and water transportation fields, or in other public utility services—are employed not only during the day, but even during the night, in alternate shifts. As a result, their weakened condition compels them at times to take some nourishment. But, in this way, they are prevented from approaching the Eucharistic fasting.

Mothers also are often unable to approach the Eucharist before they take care of their household duties, duties that demand of them many hours of work.

In the same way, it happens that there are many boys and girls in school who desire to respond to the divine invitation: "Let the little children come to me" (*Mark* 10:14). They are entirely confident that "He who dwells among the lilies" will protect their innocence of soul and purity of life against the enticements to which youth is subjected, the snares of the world. But at times it is most difficult for them, before going to school, to go to church and be nourished with the Bread of Angels and then return home to partake of the food they need.

Furthermore, it should be noted that it often happens, at the present time, that great crowds of people travel from one place to another in the afternoon hours to take part in religious celebrations or to hold meetings on social questions. Now, if on these occasions it were allowed to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is the living Fruit of divine grace and which commands our will to burn with the desire of acquiring virtue, there is no doubt that strength could be drawn from this by which all would be stirred profoundly to think and act in a Christian manner and to obey legitimate laws.

To these special considerations it seems opportune to add some which have reference to all. Although in our days medical science and that study which is called hygiene have made great progress and have helped greatly to cut down the number of deaths, especially among the young, nevertheless conditions of life at the present time and the hardships which flow from the cruel wars of this century are of such nature that they have greatly weakened bodily constitution and health.

For these reasons, and especially so that renewed piety towards the Eucharist may be all the more readily increased, many Bishops from various countries have asked, in official letters, that this law of fast be somewhat mitigated. Actually, the Apostolic See has kindly granted special faculties and permissions, in this regard, to both priests and faithful. As regards these concessions, We can cite the Decree, entitled, *Post Editum*, given for the sick by the Sacred Congregation of the Council, December 7, 1906 (*Acta S. Sedis,* XXXIX, p. 603 ff.); and the Letter of May 22, 1923, from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office to the local Ordinaries in favor of priests (S.S. Congregationis S. Officii Litterae Locorum Ordinariis datae super ieiunio eucharistico ante Missam: *AAS,* XV, p. 151 ff.).

In these latter days, the petitions of the Bishops have become more frequent and urgent, and the faculties granted were more ample, especially those that were bestowed in view of the war. This, without doubt, clearly indicates that there are new and grave reasons, reasons that are not occasional but rather general, because of which it is very difficult, in these diversified circumstances, both for the priest to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and for the faithful to receive the Bread of Angels fasting.

Wherefore, that we may meet these grave inconveniences and difficulties, that the different indults may not lead to inconsistent practice, We have deemed it necessary to lay down the discipline of the Eucharistic fast, by mitigating it in such a way that, in the greatest manner possible, all, in view of the peculiar circumstances of time, place, and the faithful, may be able to fulfill this law more easily. We, by this decree, trust that We may be able to add not a little to the increase of Eucharistic piety, and in this way to move and stir up all to partake at the Table of the Angels. This, without doubt, will increase the glory of God and the holiness of the Mystical Body of Christ.

By Our Apostolic authority We decree and command all the following:

I. The law of the Eucharistic fast from midnight continues in force for all of those who do not come under the special conditions which We are going to set forth in this Apostolic Letter. In the future it shall be a general and common principle for all, both priests and faithful, that natural water does not break the Eucharistic fast.

II. The sick, even when they are not confined to bed, can, on the prudent advice of a confessor, take something in the form of beverage or of true medicine. This does not hold for alcoholic beverages. The same faculty is given to sick priests who are going to say Mass.

III. Priests who are going to say Mass at late hours, or after onerous work of the sacred ministry, or after a long journey, can take something by way of beverage. They cannot take alcoholic beverages. They should abstain, however, for the space of one hour before they say Mass.

IV. Those who say Mass twice or three times can consume the ablutions. In such cases, however, the ablution must be made with water alone, not with wine.

V. Likewise the faithful, even those not sick, who by reason of some serious inconvenience—that is, by reason of tiring work, by reason of the late hours at which alone it is possible for them to attend Mass, or by reason of a long journey which they must take—could not approach the Eucharistic table completely fasting, can, on the advice of a prudent confessor, while the need lasts, take something to drink, with the exception of alcoholic beverages, but they must abstain at least for the space of one hour before they are nourished by the Bread of Angels.

VI. If the circumstance calls for it as necessary, We grant to the local Ordinaries the right to permit the celebration of Mass in the evening, as we said, but in such wise that the Mass shall not begin before four o'clock in the afternoon, on holy days of obligation still observed, on those which formerly were observed, on the first Friday of every month, and also on those days on which solemn celebrations are held with a large attendance, and also, in addition to these days, on one day a week; with the requirement that the priest observe a fast of three hours from solid food and alcoholic beverages, and of one hour from non-alcoholic beverages. At these Masses the faithful may approach the Holy Table, observing the same rule as regards the Eucharistic fast, the presumption of Canon 857 remaining in force.

In mission territories, in consideration of the very unusual conditions there prevailing, on account of which it often happens that there are only a few priests to visit the distant missions, the local Ordinaries can grant to the preachers of the Gospel faculties to celebrate evening Masses on other days of the week also.

Local Ordinaries shall carefully see that every interpretation is avoided that would stretch these faculties and that all abuse and irreverence in this matter is prevented. For in granting these faculties which the conditions of persons, places and times demand today, We ardently desire to emphasize the force and the value of the Eucharistic fast for those who are to receive our Divine Redeemer hidden under the Eucharistic veils. Besides, as often as the inconvenience of the body is diminished, the soul must supply as far as it can, either by internal penance or by other means, in accordance with the traditional custom of the Church which is wont to command other works to be done when it mitigates the fast. Hence, those who may enjoy the faculties granted in this matter should raise fervent prayers to heaven to adore God, to thank Him, and especially to expiate for sins and beg Him for new heavenly aid. Since all must recognize that the Eucharist "has been instituted as the permanent memorial of the Passion" (S. Thom., *Opusc.* LVII, Office for the Feast of Corpus Christi, 4th lesson: *Opera Omnia,* Rome, 1570, vol. XVII), let them from their hearts elicit those sentiments of Christian humility and Christian patience which meditation on the sufferings and death of our Divine Redeemer must arouse. Also, to our Divine Redeemer who, ever immolating Himself on our altars is repeating the greatest proof of His love, let all offer increased fruits of charity toward their neighbors. For this reason all shall co-operate toward daily fulfilling the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "Because the bread is one, we though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread" (*I. Cor.* 10:17).

Whatever decrees are contained in this letter we wish to be stable, ratified and valid, notwithstanding anything to the contrary, even what may be worthy of most special mention. All other privileges and faculties, in whatever way they may have been granted by the Holy See, are abolished, so that all may everywhere properly and equally observe this legislation.

All that has been decreed above shall be in force from the day of promulgation through the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis.*

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, January 6, 1953, the Feast of the Epiphany, in the fourteenth year of our Pontificate.

POPE PIUS XII

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO SANCTI OFFICII

INSTRUCTIO

DE DISCIPLINA CIRCA IEIUNIUM EUCHARISTICUM SERVANDA

Constitutio Apostolica *Christus Dominus,* hoc ipso die a Summo Pontifice Pio XII, feliciter regnante, data, largitur quidem non paucas facultates ac dispensationes circa legis ieiunii eucharistici observantiam, sed normas maxima ex parte quoad substantiam quoque confirmat Codicis Iuris Canonici (can. 808 et 858, § 1) impositas sacerdotibus et fidelibus, qui eidem legi obtemperare queant. Attamen hisce etiam extenditur favorabile ipsius Constitutionis primum praescriptum, cuius vi aqua *naturalis* (id est sine ulla cuiuslibet elementi adiectione) non amplius frangit ieiunium eucharisticum (Const. n. I). Quod vero attinet ad ceteras concessiones, iis tantum uti possunt sacerdotes et fideles, qui in peculiaribus versantur condicionibus, de quibus in Constitutione cautum est, vel Missas vespertinas celebrant aut in iisdem sacram communionem recipiunt ex licentia Ordinariorum, intra limites novarum facultatum, quae iisdem tributae sunt.

Itaque, ut normae ad huiusmodi concessiones pertinentes ubique conformi ratione serventur atque evitetur quaelibet interpretatio, quae concessas facultates amplificet, utque ab omni abusu hac de re caveatur, Suprema haec Sacra Congregatio Sancti Officii, iussu mandatuque Summi ipsius Pontificis, statuit quae sequuntur:

QUOAD INFIRMOS SIVE FIDELES SIVE SACERDOTES

(Const. n. II)

1. Fideles infirmi, etiamsi non decumbant, aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus, exceptis alcoholicis, si, suae infirmitatis causa, usque ad sacrae communionis receptionem ieiunium, absque gravi incommodo, nequeunt servare integrum; possunt etiam aliquid sumere per modum medicinae, sive liquidum (exclusis alcoholicis), sive solidum, dummodo de vera medicina agatur, a medico praescripta vel uti tali vulgo recepta. Advertendum autem est, non posse tamquam medicina haberi quodlibet solidum pro nutrimento sumptum.

2. Condiciones, quibus quis dispensatione a lege ieiunii frui possit, nulla adiecta ante communionem temporis limitatione, prudenter a confessario perpendendae sunt, neque quisquam sine eius consilio uti potest. Confessarius autem suum consilium dare poterit sive in foro interno sacramentali, sive in foro interno extrasacramentali, etiam semel pro semper, perdurantibus eiusdem infirmitatis condicionibus.

3. Sacerdotes infirmi, etiamsi non decumbant, dispensatione pariter uti possunt, sive sint Missam celebraturi, sive sanctissimam Eucharistiam recepturi.

QUOAD SACERDOTES QUI IN PECULIARIBUS ADIUNCTIS VERSANTUR

(Const. nn. III et IV)

4. Sacerdotes non infirmi, qui *a*) vel *tardioribus horis* (i. e. post horam nonam), *b*) vel *post gravem sacri ministerii laborem* (v. gr. iam a summo mane seu per longum tempus), *c*) vel *post longum iter* (i. e. saltem 2 km. circiter pedibus percurrendum, vel proportionate longius pro variis vehiculis adhibitis, difficultatis quoque itineris vel personae habita ratione), celebraturi sunt, aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus, exclusis alcoholicis.

5. Tres casus supra numerati tales sunt, ut omnia comprehendant rerum adiuncta, in quibus legislator praefatam facultatem concedere intendit ideoque quaelibet vitetur interpretatio quae facultates concessas amplificet.

6. Sacerdotes, qui in hisce adiunctis versantur aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus semel vel pluries, servato ieiunio unius horae ante Missae celebrationem.

7. Praeterea omnes sacerdotes, qui bis vel ter sunt Missam celebraturi, possunt in prioribus Missis duas ablutiones a rubricis Missalis praescriptas sumere, sed tantum adhibita aqua, quae quidem, iuxta novum principium, ieiunium non frangit.

Qui tamen die Nativitatis Domini vel in Commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum tres Missas sine intermissione celebrat, quod ad ablutiones attinet, rubricas observare tenetur.

8. Si vero sacerdos, qui bis vel ter Missam celebrare debet, per inadvertentiam vinum quoque in ablutione sumat, non vetatur quominus secundam et tertiam Missam celebret.

QUOAD FIDELES QUI IN PECULIARIBUS ADIUNCTIS VERSANTUR

(Const. n. V)

9. Fidelibus pariter, qui non infirmitatis causa, sed *ob aliud grave incommodum* ieiunium eucharisticum servare nequeunt, aliquid sumere licet per modum potus, exceptis tamen alcoholicis et servato ieiunio unius horae ante sacrae communionis receptionem.

10. Casus autem gravis incommodi tres enumerantur, quos extendere non licet.

a) *Labor debilitans* ante sacram communionem susceptus.

Hoc labore afficiuntur tum opifices, qui, officinis vel vehicularibus maritimisque muneribus vel aliis publicae utilitatis officiis addicti, diu noctuque per vices occupantur; tum illi, qui ex officio vel ex caritate noctem vigilem transigunt (v. gr. valetudinarii, custodes nocturni, etc.); tum mulieres praegnantes et matresfamilias quae, antequam ecclesiam adire queant, in domesticis negotiis per longum tempus incumbere debent, etc.

b) *Hora tardior, qua sacra communio recipitur.*

Sunt enim haud pauci fideles, qui tantummodo serioribus horis possunt apud se sacerdotem habere, qui sacris operetur; sunt pueri complures, quibus nimis grave est, antequam ad scholam se conferant, ecclesiam adire, angelico pane vesci, postea vero domum reverti, ientaculi sumendi gratia.

c) *Longum iter peragendum,* ut ad ecclesiam perveniatur.

Longum autem hac super re habendum iter, ut supra explicatum est (n. 4), si saltem 2 km. circiter pedibus percurrendum, vel proportionate longius pro variis vehiculis adhibitis, difficultatis quoque itineris vel personae habita ratione.

11. Causae quidem gravis incommodi sunt prudenter a confessario pensitandae in foro interno sacramentali vel non sacramentali; neque absque eiusdem consilio fideles non ieiuni sanctissimam Eucharistiam recipere possunt. Confessarius autem consilium eiusmodi dare potest etiam *semel pro semper,* causa eadem gravis incommodi perdurante.

QUOAD MISSAS VESPERTINAS

(Const. n. VI)

Constitutionis vi *Ordinarii locorum* (cfr. can. 198) facultate fruuntur permittendi in proprio territorio Missae vespertinae celebrationem, si adiuncta id necessario exigunt, praescripto can. 821, § 1, non obstante. Bonum enim commune aliquando sacrorum mysteriorum celebrationem post meridiem expostulat: v. gr. pro quarundam industriarum opificibus, qui festis quoque diebus laboribus succedunt in vices; pro illis operariorum classibus, qui matutinis festorum horis occupantur, ut muneribus portuum addicti; pro iis pariter, qui ex dissitis etiam regionibus maxima frequentia in unum locum conveniunt, ad quandam festivitatem religiosam vel socialem celebrandam, etc.

12. Tamen eiusmodi Missae celebrari possunt non ante horam quartam post meridiem, ac tantummodo in certis diebus *taxative* statutis seu

a) festis de praecepto vigentibus, ad normam can. 1247, § 1;

b) festis de praecepto suppressis, iuxta Indicem a S. Congregatione Concilii editum, die 28 Decembris 1919 (cfr. *A. A. S.* vol. XII, 1920, pp. 42-43);

c) primis cuiusque mensis feriis sextis;

d) ceteris sollemnibus, qui cum magno populi concursu celebrantur;

e) die uno in hebdomada, praeter dies supra memoratos, si bonum peculiarium personarum classium id postulat.

13. Sacerdotes, qui pomeridianis horis Missam celebrant, itemque fideles qui in eadem sacram communionem recipiunt, possunt *inter refectionem,* permissam usque ad tres horas ante Missae vel communionis initium, sumere *congrua moderatione* alcoholicas quoque potiones inter mensam suetas (v. gr. vinum, cerevisiam, etc.), exclusis quidem liquoribus. Quoad potus autem, quos sumere possunt ante vel post dictam refectionem, usque ad unam horam ante Missam vel communionem, excluditur *omne alcoholicorum genus.*

14. Sacerdotes, eodem die, nequeunt mane et vespere Sacrum litare, nisi potestatem expressam bis terve Missam celebrandi habeant, ad normam can. 806.

Fideles pariter, eodem die, nequeunt mane et vespere ad sacram Synaxim accedere, ad praescriptum can. 857.

15. Fideles, quamvis non sint de eorum numero, pro quibus Missa vespertina forte instituta sit, ad sacram Synaxim libere accedere possunt, *infra dictam Missam* vel *proxime ante et statim*

post (cfr. can. 846, §1), servatis, quod attinet ad ieiunium eucharisticum, normis supra relatis.

16. In locis vero, ubi non *ius commune,* sed *ius missionum* viget, Ordinarii Missas vespertinas omnibus in hebdomada diebus, iisdem condicionibus permittere possunt.

MONITA AD NORMAS EXSEQUENDAS

17. Ordinarii sedulo invigilent, ut omnis abusus et irreverentia erga sanctissimum Sacramentum plane vitetur.

18. Pariter curent, ut nova disciplina a cunctis subditis uniformiter observetur, eosque doceant, omnes facultates et dispensationes, tum territoriales tum personales, hactenus a Sancta Sede concessas, abrogatas esse.

19. Constitutionis atque huius Instructionis interpretatio textui fideliter adhaereat, neque ullo modo facultates tam favorabiles amplificet. Quod ad consuetudines attinet, quibus a nova disciplina discrepare contingat, clausula illa abrogativa animadvertenda est: "contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus, peculiarissima etiam mentione dignis".

20. Ordinarii et sacerdotes, qui datis a Sancta Sede facultatibus perfrui debent, fideles studiose excitent, ut frequenter Missae Sacrificio adstare velint et pane eucharistico reficiantur, opportunisque inceptis, praesertim sacra praedicatione, illud promoveant spirituale bonum, cuius adipiscendi gratia Summus Pontifex Pius XII Constitutionem edere voluit.

Summus Pontifex, hanc Instructionem approbans, statuit, ut ipsa promulgetur per editionem in *Actis Apostolicae Sedis* una cum Constitutione Apostolica *Christus Dominus.*

Ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die VI mensis Ianuarii, anno MDCCCCLIII.

✠ I. Card. PIZZARDO, *a Secretis*

L. ✠ S.

A. Ottaviani, *Adsessor*

THE SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

AN INSTRUCTION ON THE DISCIPLINE TO BE OBSERVED WITH REFERENCE TO THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

The Apostolic Constitution "Christus Dominus," issued today by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII happily reigning, grants several faculties and dispensations with respect to the observance of the law of the Eucharistic fast. It also confirms, in great measure and substantially, the rules of the Code of Canon Law (can. 808 and 858, § 1) for the priests and the faithful able to observe that law of the Eucharistic fast. Nevertheless, the favorable first order of this Constitution, according to which natural water (that is, without the addition of any element) no longer breaks the Eucharistic fast (Const., n. 1), is extended to these people also. But, with regard to the other concessions, these can be used only by priests and by the faithful who find themselves in the conditions described in the Constitution, or by those who say evening Masses or receive Holy Communion at such Masses authorized by the Ordinaries within the limits of the new faculties granted to them.

And so, in order that the rules with regard to such concessions may be observed uniformly everywhere, in order to avoid any interpretation which would make these faculties appear more extensive than they really are, and in order to prevent every abuse in this matter, this Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, at the direction and by the command of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, has ordered the following:

WITH REGARD TO THE SICK, EITHER THE PRIESTS OR THE FAITHFUL

(Constitution, n. 2)

1) The faithful who are sick, even though not confined to bed, may take something in the form of beverage, though not an alcoholic beverage, if, by reason of their sickness they cannot, without real inconvenience, observe a complete fast up to the time they receive Holy Communion. They can also take something in the line of medicine, either liquid (but not alcoholic) or solid, as long as what they take is real medicine, prescribed by a physician or commonly esteemed as such. It must be noted that any solid taken as nourishment cannot be considered as medicine.

2) The conditions under which a person may be able to take advantage of this dispensation from the law of fasting for which no time limit preceding Holy Communion is prescribed must be judged very prudently by the confessor. Without his advice no one can use this dispensation. The confessor, however, can give his advice either when he is hearing confessions or privately apart from the confessional. He may also give this advice once so that the person to whom he gives it may always act upon it as long as the conditions of this same sickness last.

3) Sick priests, even though they are not confined to their beds, may use a like dispensation if they are going to say Mass or receive the Holy Eucharist.

WITH REGARD TO PRIESTS PLACED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

(Constitution, nn. 3 and 4)

4) Priests who are not sick, but who are going to say Mass
   a) at a late hour (that is, after nine o'clock),
   b) after onerous work of the sacred ministry (for example, from early in the morning or for a long time), or
   c) after a long journey (that is, at least about a mile and a quarter walking or a proportionally longer trip in terms of the classes of vehicles used, the difficulties of the journey, and the condition of the person),

may take something in the form of drink, but not any alcoholic beverages.

5) The three cases indicated above are such as to take in all the circumstances in which the legislator intends to grant the above-mentioned faculty. Consequently every interpretation which would make these faculties seem more extensive must be avoided.

6) Priests who are in such circumstances can take something in the line of drink once or many times, but they must keep the fast for one hour before they say Mass.

7) Moreover all priests who are going to say Mass twice or three times the same day can, in the earlier Masses, consume the two ablutions prescribed by the rubrics of the Missal, but using only the water which, according to the new principle, does not break the fast.

The priest who says three Masses, one after the other, on Christmas or on All Souls Day is bound to follow the rubrics with regard to the ablutions.

8) If it should happen that a priest who is obliged to say Mass two or three times the same day should inadvertently consume wine in the ablution, he is not prevented from saying the second and the third Mass.

WITH REGARD TO THE FAITHFUL PLACED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

(Constitution, n. 5)

9) Likewise the faithful who are unable to keep the Eucharistic fast, not by reason of sickness, but because of some serious difficulty, can take something in the line of drink. They cannot, however, take any alcoholic beverage, and they must fast for an hour before the reception of Holy Communion.

10) The cases of serious difficulty (*gravis incommodi*) are these three. It is wrong to add any others.

a) Work that weakens, started before Holy Communion. Such is the function of laborers in factories, transport and dock workers, or workers in other public utilities employed in day and night shifts; of those who, by reason of duty or of charity, must stay awake during the night (for example, nurses, night watchmen, etc.); and of pregnant women and mothers of families who must spend a long time on their household duties before they can go to church, etc.

b) The late hour at which Holy Communion is received. There are many of the faithful who can have a priest to say Mass among them only at a late hour. There are likewise many children for whom it would be too difficult, before going to school, to go to the church, receive Holy Communion, and then to go back home to eat breakfast, etc.

c) A long journey which must be made in order to reach the church. As has been explained above (n. 4), a trip is to be considered long for this purpose if it covers a walk of about a mile and a quarter, or a journey that is longer in proportion to the vehicles used, the difficulty of the journey itself, or the condition of the person making the journey.

11) The nature of such serious difficulty must be judged prudently by a confessor either while he is hearing confessions or in a private conversation with the one seeking advice. The faithful cannot receive the Holy Eucharist not fasting without the confessor's advice. The confessor can give his advice once and for all, to be effective as long as the cause of the serious difficulty remains.

WITH REFERENCE TO EVENING MASSES

(Constitution, n. 6)

By the force of the Constitution the Ordinaries of places (cf. can. 198) have the faculty of permitting the saying of evening Masses in their own territory, should circumstances render this necessary. This holds true despite the command of canon 821, § 1. The common good sometimes demands the saying of Mass after midday: for example, for the workers in some industries who work their shifts even on feast days, for those categories of workers who must be on the job during the morning hours of feast days, like dock workers, and likewise for those who have come in great numbers and from considerable distances for some religious or social celebration, etc.

12) Such Masses, however, may not be said before four o'clock in the afternoon, and may be celebrated only on the following definitely stated days. These are:

a) Holy days of obligation according to the rule of canon 1247, § 1

b) Feasts which were formerly holy days of obligation but which now are not. These are listed in the Index published by the Sacred Congregation of the Council on Dec. 28, 1919 (*AAS*, XII, 1920, 42 f.)

c) First Fridays of the month

d) Other solemn occasions which are celebrated with great gatherings of the people

e) On one day of the week other than those enumerated above, if the good of special classes of persons should demand it.

13) Priests who say afternoon Masses, as well as the faithful who receive Holy Communion at these Masses, may, at the meal which is permitted up to three hours before the beginning of Mass or Communion, take with due moderation the alcoholic beverages which are ordinarily taken at meals (for example, wine, beer, and the like). They may not take strong liquors. With regard to beverages, which can be taken before or after the above-mentioned meal, up to one hour before Mass or Communion, everything alcoholic is excluded.

14) Priests may not say a morning and an evening Mass on the same day unless they have the explicit permission to say Mass twice or three times the same day, according to the rule of can. 806.

Likewise the faithful cannot receive Holy Communion in the morning and the evening of the same day, according to the norm of canon 857.

15) The faithful, even though they may not be of the number of those for whom the offering of an evening Mass was decreed, may freely receive Holy Communion at this Mass or immediately before it or immediately after it (cf. can. 846, § 1), if they obey the directions given above with reference to the Eucharistic fast.

16) In places where the law for the missions rather than the general law is in force, the Ordinaries may permit evening Masses on all the days of the week under the same conditions.

ADMONITIONS ON THE OBSERVANCE OF THE RULES

17) Ordinaries must carefully see to it that every abuse and irreverence towards the Blessed Sacrament is entirely avoided.

18) They must also take care that the new discipline be observed uniformly by all their subjects, and they must teach these subjects that all faculties and dispensations, both territorial and personal, which have hitherto been granted by the Holy See, have been revoked.

19) The interpretation of the Constitution and of this Instruction must faithfully keep to the text, and must not in any way enlarge the highly favorable faculties which have been granted. With regard to customs which may differ from the new discipline, let the abrogating clause be kept in mind: "notwithstanding any disposition whatever to the contrary, even those worthy of most special mention."

20) The Ordinaries and the priests, who ought to take advantage of these faculties granted by the Holy See, should zealously stir up the faithful to assist at Mass and receive Holy Communion frequently. They should take advantage of every opportunity, especially by preaching, to promote the spiritual good for the sake of which the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII has published the Constitution.

The Sovereign Pontiff, approving this Instruction, decreed that it should be promulgated by publication in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* together with the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus.*

From the Palace of the Holy Office, on the 6th day of January, in the year 1953.

✠ JOSEPH CARDINAL PIZZARDO, *Secretary*

L. ✠ S.

Alfredo Ottaviani, *Assessor*

Book Reviews

GUIDE TO THE BIBLE. Vol. I. Published under the Direction of A. Robert and T. Tricot. Translated by Edward P. Arbez, S.S., and Martin R. P. McGuire. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1951. Pp. xxvii + 530. $5.50.

When the one-volume collection of studies entitled *Initiation Biblique* appeared in France in 1939, its editors (respectively a Sulpician and a diocesan priest, both Professors of Sacred Scripture in the Faculty of Catholic Theology of Paris), indicated that they had not meant to produce a textbook, citing in evidence the non-didactic and non-academic treatment accorded the subject matter; nor yet an encyclopedia, and here they pointed to the brevity and synthesis of the essays. Their avowed purpose was to stimulate reflection on the Sacred Text in adult students and readers whose interests required "the renewal of contacts with the sources of Catholic doctrine and spiritual life in a direct and personal manner." Despite the modest terms of its launching, this work of thirty collaborators has since its appearance been in constant use among seminary instructors and others engaged in higher religious education. Such is the scholarly competence of the authors. News of a translation was welcome, but an acquaintance with the supplementary features of what proved to be an American *edition* (Belgian produced) reveals the work as doubly welcome. The present editors (one a Professor Emeritus of Semitics and the other a Professor of Greek and Latin at The Catholic University of America) have enlisted the services of several translators, largely religious sisters, appending to their efforts bibliographic aids both up to date and of value, and a set of enlightened and amplified footnotes. The substitution of a nine-page section on English vernacular translations, by P. W. Skehan, for Bardy's like contribution on French-language Bibles, is the other notable feature. Only three parts of an eleven-part whole go to make this volume, although the contents of the remainder are indexed in detail. D'Alès and Lagrange, the instructors of many whose writing is included, had agreed to contribute but were kept from it by death. They have since been followed by Chaine, Huby, Vigué, and others.

Robert's introductory observations on the Bible as a whole are followed by Pirot (his colleague in editing the *Supplément* to Vigouroux' *Dictionnaire de la Bible*) on inspiration, a masterpiece of lucidity, plus a further note of Robert on literary genres. The progress of Catholic scholarship since 1905 is delicately conveyed in the evaluation of the decrees of the Biblical Commission of that year. Note 2 on p. 15 might have indicated the existence in English of Chaine's essay on inspiration in Lagrange (*Père Lagrange and the Scriptures,* tr. Murphy, Bruce, 1946), since the small body of Catholic biblical scholarship available in our tongue is generally noted. Tricot handles the questions of canon and apocrypha; Osty particularizes neatly some commonly transmitted generalizations on the linguistic geniuses of scriptural Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. A discussion of the Old Testament books, taken singly, is divided between Robert and Chaine, while Huby analyzes the occasion, style, content, and authenticity of all in the New. There is found in both treatments a liberal spirit in the best Catholic sense, with no doubtful positions strongly adhered to out of a mistaken sense of dogmatic necessity. The two editors attack the problem of literary genres and the synoptic question at considerable length; textual transmission is taken by Tisserant and Lagrange, Greek and Oriental versions by Bardy, the Latin by Tricot. There is a final chapter of fivefold authorship on interpretation, chiefly the history of exegesis. The names of Bonsirven, Vaganay, and A. Vincent are encountered here.

The translation is a matter of great ease, in the main, save for an occasional Gallican *déja* shining through, or a "but also . . . as well." The intricate bibliographies are remarkably free from error (the curious-minded will have spotted lapses in the notes on pp. 88, 98, 136, whilst on p. 413 the irrepressible Pope Damascus rides again). Taken all together, the book is a remarkable achievement. The English-speaking world could have been so much worse served by a single manual on the Bible that the double blessing of authorship and editorship demands acknowledgment for the rare combination that it is.

GERARD S. SLOYAN

HEAVEN AND EARTH. By Carlo Coccioli. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952. Pp. 318. $3.50.

This is the story of Don Ardito Piccardi, an Italian priest, and of his ideals. His vocation was occasioned by and for long rooted in a vivid appreciation of the reality of Satan. And through his seminary days and early years of the priesthood he understood the demands of that vocation only in terms of an active and unremitting struggle against Satan. Because Don Ardito deeply felt that he could not measure up to this struggle in the well-organized parish to which he was first assigned, he was sent to care for the souls in a poor village in the mountains. There he labored strenuously but with a zeal that was edged with hardness and coldness until a series of crises made him unsure of the path he had set himself.

The next phase of his life was spent in a large city where during the late thirties he became a leader and director of Catholic intellectual activities. "I first venerated the law and then worshipped knowledge. . . ." By his lectures and publications he won wide applause as he attacked with persuasive logic the cowardice and hypocrisy of the so-called Christian. But in spite of his rigid adherence to this new ideal and plan of campaign, Don Ardito was still at times oppressed with uncertainty that this was the road for him. Once more a series of crises bore down upon him. Finally, at the bedside of his old friend and professor of theology, he seems to have heard the message for which he had been waiting. "The simplest answers . . . Love, *Love*. . . ." So Don Ardito came to leave his work in the city and returned to his old parish in the mountains to "love God in men." There he died a martyr of charity offering himself as the victim when reprisals were demanded for killings attributed to Partisans in his parish.

The real story of a saint will always be moving and bewildering; moving, because everyone, saint and sinner, believer and unbeliever, knows in his own and perhaps confused way that there is only one thing truly important— to be a saint. And such a story will bewilder, for owing to our natural myopia sanctity will always appear blurred to those of us who are not saints. The principles of sanctity are paradoxes to the natural man within us, and God's grace and our cooperation are mysteries. Human words and rhetoric cannot fully explain the saint nor completely reveal each layer and fold of motive and response.

So with this story of Don Ardito who came to be regarded as a saint by those who knew him. The priest who reads Coccioli's *Heaven and Earth* will be stirred by parts of it and he will be bewildered. But for some of that bewilderment the novelist himself is to blame—not because he chose the materials that he did but for the way he handles them.

Take such matters as these. Although developed at some length and from several points of view, the motives of Don Ardito for leaving his first assignment as a curate are not made clear and solid enough to support the dramatic intensity of that decision. His profound and long discouragement about the death of the young homosexual offers certain difficulties if it is to be squared with the attitudes he maintained during the years at Chiarotorre and the Little Club. The problems of Adriana and her mother are too vaguely sketched for the weight they are supposed to carry in the novel. The acceptance by the German officer of Don Ardito as a reprisal victim raises a number of questions.

Then there is the inner man himself. Grant that Don Ardito by his fight against Satan could move far along the road to holiness. Yet essentially this is a reaction which may, it is true, serve to resist the gravitational pull of earthly objects; but love is the only positive force strong and enduring enough to move one always upwards toward God. Part of Don Ardito's ambiguity, then, arises from ambiguity of motivation and his essential failure to understand himself. Or from another point of view. This priest sometimes appears to be a man of relentless logic and intellectually completely sure of himself; sometimes he appears to be distraught, highly emotional, almost hysterical. The novelist gives us a portrait of a man of deep sincerity, but the lines of his drawing seem to waver because that sincerity at one time had its foundations in feeling, at another in intellect, at another in will.

This is to create mystification, not dramatic intensity. I cannot agree, therefore, with those who regard this as a great book because of the author's choice of theme or the vital quality of his writing. There are many brilliant passages in the novel, but a steadily focused clarity is lacking. On the other hand, I would not concur with those who rather totally condemn the book for the way in which the novelist has handled his materials. He merits full marks for choosing an important theme and studying it seriously.

Moreover, it is useful to keep in mind that (whether owing to merit or to publishers) Italian literary movements are quite usually regarded here and in England as among the most significant and vigorous in the contemporary world. If this novel, Coccioli's first to be translated into English, is typical of his ability and his outlook, then it seems only wise for a critic to hope that writers like Carlo Coccioli, and not those like Alberto Moravia, will give direction to Italian literary currents.

E. J. DRUMMOND, S.J.

EFFECTIVE PREACHING. By Rev. Thomas V. Liske. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952. Pp. 284. $3.50.

Of what use to the man in the pew is the preacher's knowledge of theology if the theology is not made interesting: for the listener has to be interested before he decides to change his ways or to move higher, spiritually? There are trends in the art of preaching just as there are in any other art. Gone are the Delsarte gestures, gone, the long tract-like divisions and subdivisions, but the principle of interest remains. And it is about this principle that Father Liske has woven an excellent handbook for priest and seminarian.

The chapter on "Communication, Not a Recitation" is splendidly handled. With quiet humor, the author throws his darts at the diehard who refuses to spend himself in the pulpit simply because he has "got by" thus far without doing so. "How about the time you were called out on an attempted steal of second base? You jumped to your feet from the dust, alert, intent; your face was most expressive . . . your words were full of force, you emphasized your ideas on the subject, using your entire body in the communication of your thoughts. . . . Suppose, however, you arose slowly from the dust, stood aloof with eyes averted, hands at your side, and spoke in a low voice to protest the decision. . . . We are not always aware that our best communication is done in ordinary conversation."

Sober experience at his back, Father Liske waits for the objections of the reluctant and the indifferent: "Well, my congregation always listens to what I have to say," or, "I've got along five years without making a gesture," etc., etc. Perhaps the congregation only *seems* to listen. Perhaps it is just waiting for the bitter end: it cannot very well get up and leave. Perhaps your listeners wish to heaven you *would* feel something so deeply some Sunday that the feeling would overflow in a gesture or two. And then there is the old bromidic notion: if the preacher uses any tricks (however tame and legitimate) to secure interest he must be covering up; the "matter" must be weak. Father Liske is ready for all these objections. He is no less firm with the "ham actor" and the exhibitionist.

In a consideration of "What the Listeners Want" the oratorical merits of Roosevelt and Dewey are weighed; estimations were submitted by a variety of radio listeners, some of them speech experts. It is concluded that Roosevelt easily established audience contact by conversational tones. Dewey is too formal and gives "orotund solemnity to unimportant parts of his speeches."

The composition of a sermon is treated in part two. Indeed the greater portion of the book deals with effective writing: proportion, persuasiveness, the use of illustrations and imagery. It is all well arranged and might serve as a highly practical text for the classroom.

Father Liske laments that "in many seminaries the speech training is haphazard." He pleads for trained teachers of speech, a good foundation in English and a basic course in oratory throughout the minor